3 1761 09343924 8

52

Wm Hamilton Drummond.

The National Churches.

EDITED BY

P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.HIST.S.

THE

CHURCH IN FRANCE.

From C. Tallon's Carte des Archéveschés.

Pub by Saint Jorre, Rue Richelieu 21.

HECT
S

THE

CHURCH IN FRANCE

BY

RICHARD TRAVERS SMITH, D.D.,

VICAR OF S. BARTHOLOMEW'S, AND CANON OF S. PATRICK'S, DUBLIN.

AUTHOR OF "THE CHURCH IN ROMAN GAUL" (S.P.C.K.), ETC.

With Maps.

459935
28. 5. 47

LONDON:

WELLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO.

3 PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.

AND 44 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

1894

PREFACE.

No attempt has been made in the following chapters to supply the framework of secular history in which that of the Church of France is set, except where, as not seldom happened, the action of each upon each was too marked to be omitted. The proper history is so crowded and varied that it was also necessary to pass over movements such as the Crusades and Foreign Missions, which, however closely connected with the Church of France, yet took place beyond her borders.

In order to avoid constant reference throughout a large portion of the book, especially the mediæval times, the author desires here once for all to acknowledge his great obligations to the Abbé Guettée's *Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, twelve vols., Paris, 1856, extending to the Concordat of Napoleon I. This work, though much approved by ecclesiastics of position, was placed when about two-thirds completed upon the Index. No reason for this disapproval was given, but it can hardly have lain in a doubt of the Abbé's truthfulness, which is absolute both for the periods published before and after his censure. It affected him, however, so severely that he withdrew from the Roman into the Greek Communion, and his standpoint therefore resembles our own.

It is hoped that nothing may be found in the following pages to deepen misunderstandings, national and religious, which are too bitter already. We cannot affect to ignore our differences with the Church of France, especially in the views of Papal authority to which she has in these years so unreservedly committed herself: not, we must hold, because of benefits which the Papacy has done to the religion of France in the course of history. But even such a difference need not repel our sympathy from a body which on every principle, Christian and human, is so fitted to engage it and to repay it by interest and instruction. Alas, French churchmen are little interested in the Church of England. Their utterances regarding her often display quite the same intense and ill informed dislike as that to which we are so well accustomed in French political writing and speech about England. Appreciation of the English Church is left to writers like M. Taine, who admire her friendly relations to English society as a contrast to what he sees at home, but whose praise is so entirely secular as to make for religious people almost as unpleasant reading as the blame of the others. If any French churchman would study the Church of England in earnest he would find her very willing to listen to his criticisms, however severe; for it is not her way to believe that self-admiration is good for a Church any more than for an individual Christian.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE GALLIC CHURCH IN ROMAN TIMES	1
II. DIVINES AND SAINTS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY	24
III. THE COMING OF THE FRANKS	43
IV. THE CHURCH UNDER THE BARBARIANS	68
V. THE CARLOVINGIANS	91
VI. POWERS ROYAL, EPISCOPAL, METROPOLITAN, AND PAPAL	111
VII. THE CRUSADES AND THE COMMUNES	135
VIII. THE GREAT ABBOTS	152
IX. THE MENDICANTS	175
X. THE POPES IN FRANCE	199
XI. THE GREAT SCHISM	217
XII. BEGINNINGS OF THE REFORMATION	237
XIII. WARS OF RELIGION	260
XIV. THE SAINT BARTHOLOMEW	279
XV. THE PEACE OF HENRY IV.	297
XVI. THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL	318
XVII. JANSENISM	338

PAGE

XVIII. THE WAR OF THE FIVE PROPOSITIONS . . 358

XIX. REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES . . 375

XX. THE BULL UNIGENITUS 395

XXI. THE REVOLUTION 418

XXII. THE EMPIRE AND THE CONCORDAT . . . 438

XXIII. THE CHURCH OF FRANCE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 454

INDEX 481

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

CHAPTER I.

THE GALLIC CHURCH IN ROMAN TIMES.

Beginnings of the Church of France—The martyrs of Lyons—Connection with Asia Minor—S. Cyprian—Legends of Northern Gaul—The Bagaudæ—Constantius Chlorus—Literary culture—The Crusade of Constantine—Gaul under Constantius—S. Hilary of Poitiers—Arian controversy.

MANY of the dioceses of France claim to have been founded in Apostolic times. We can by no means pronounce the claim inadmissible: the balance of probabilities would lead us to think it true. The New Testament itself shows us how frequent was the intercourse between Rome and the provinces of her empire, and it is certain that an important Church grew up in Rome itself by the natural access of Christians from the East before ever an apostle appeared there. Gaul was not only in constant communication with Rome, but also with the East. Christians were sure to come, and everything we know of their religion in its first days leads us to think that they would come as missionaries. We see, therefore, little likelihood in the theory of some historians that before the first

recorded mission to Gaul no Christian societies existed there save those which consisted of stray foreign traders.

But we may accept this probability without recognising as genuine the names of apostolic founders which the traditions of Gallic Churches offer. Quite a number of these would seem to have sprung from a reading which holds a place in the margin of our Revised Version of 2 Tim. iv. 10. If this reading were correct, S. Paul sent Crescens to Gaul; and accordingly the Church of Vienne claims Crescens as its first bishop. His name perhaps suggested those of S. Luke and S. Trophimus, who are mentioned in the same chapter as companions along with him of S. Paul. S. Luke appears in tradition as introducing the faith into Brittany, and S. Trophimus is named as the founder of the Church of Arles.

But whatever legends surround the early history of Gallic Christianity, it possesses in the story of the martyrs of Lyons one of the most affecting and best attested of all the records of primitive faith. The narrative is preserved for us in a letter, A.D. 177, from the Christians of Lyons and Vienne to their parent Church in Asia. The historian Eusebius incorporates it with his work. The first impulse of persecution seems to have been due to popular feeling. The enemies of the Empire were pressing hard upon its frontiers, and the Romans, in the cruelty of fear, demanded Christian blood. The victims came from various classes. There was Vettius Epagathus, a noble Gaul and a Roman citizen. There was Sanctus

the deacon of Vienne, and Pothinus the aged bishop; and among them all there was none who displayed a more resolute spirit than the poor slave Blandina.

The narrative of these events is in Greek: for the earliest records of Gallic Christianity connect it not with the Latin race or language, but with Asia Minor and the Greek tongue. The Latin race was slow to receive a spiritual message. The Christianity even of Rome itself was very Greek until a period subsequent to this date, and that of Gaul was Greek not merely because of the Eastern origin of our religion, but because Southern Gaul was full of Greek influences and connections. Marseilles was the port of entrance to the country, and it was Greek by foundation and retained much of its nationality. The mission which Pothinus led had come to Gaul from Smyrna, and brought the religion which S. Paul and S. John had taught in the regions near to Ephesus.

A member of the mission still more eminent than its bishop was Irenæus, whose writings are precious remains of the Christian literature of the second century. He himself tells us from what source he derived his knowledge of the truth. He had been in his early years a hearer of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who himself was a disciple of S. John. Polycarp in his day had recorded the conversation of S. John and other witnesses of the Lord's life and works. Through Irenæus then, and doubtless through other preachers whose names are lost to us, the Church of Gaul is directly connected with the most primitive sources of Christian belief.

During the persecution at Lyons, Irenæus was at Rome. He had been sent thither to convey the judgment of the Christian prisoners in Gaul upon the current heresy of Montanus. There is no doubt of the respect which he and his Gallic brethren entertained for the Roman Church, as by her place of dignity and her apostolic origin the chief depositary of Catholic tradition; but their respect was not such as to prevent them from offering advice. Another instance also is known in which Irenæus seems disposed to admonish rather than to follow the Pope. It is the case of Pope Victor, who made a premature attempt to secure uniformity in the observance of Easter by excommunicating the Eastern Churches. Irenæus agreed with the Pope in the rule, but differed with him as to the expediency of breaking the bond of peace for such a question. Thus early in the history of the Gallic Church do its relations to Rome become important.

The chief literary work of Irenæus is an exposure of the heresies of his time. It was in Greek, but we possess it for the most part in a Latin translation. The heresies were those of Gnosticism, that plague which in various forms troubled the early Church. Gnosticism was marked by unbounded license of speculation: fantastic creations of the imagination took the place of revealed truth, and the mysteries of human and divine existence were supposed to be explained by being expressed in a pretentious form. To have learnt such large and mysterious utterances was regarded as an initiation, setting the adept above the vulgar, and a

filthy life was invested with sublimity when described in lofty and obscure language.

These doctrines had their origin in Oriental imaginations. But it would be hasty to assume that Irenæus found no traces of them in Gaul. It is not improbable that the progress of Gnosticism in Gaul induced him to join the mission from Smyrna. And when in the commencement of his great work he mentions his constant use of the Celtic tongue, it is not to excuse himself for dealing with subjects outside the range of his daily work, but simply to account for a Greek style spoiled by the daily use of a barbarous language. The excuse is the more valid if we suppose that the matters of which he was about to write were the same of which he had to speak to his flock. All sorts of races and religions met in Southern Gaul, and any traces of the mysterious beliefs of Druidism which might remain in the land would be further helps to the spread of a dreamy heresy. It is, therefore, very probable that Gnosticism existed in Gaul. Certain it is that kindred heresies have had during the course of history a great hold upon Southern France. Many centuries farther on we shall have occasion to remember the systems against which Irenæus argued.

S. Irenæus was martyred A.D. 202, in the violent persecution of the Emperor Severus. Some years before there dwelt in the city of Autun a wealthy citizen named Faustus, decurion of his town. Three believers, driven from Lyons by the persecution under M. Aurelius, revealed the Gospel to him. His wife and their son, Symphorian, were baptized along with him.

When the persecution under Severus arose, Faustus was dead, but his widow and son survived. The city of Autun was given to the worship of Cybele, the mother of the gods. Symphorian refused to humble himself before her car, and was haled before Heraclius, who was then in the city with a commission to search for Christians. And as he was dragged to execution, his aged mother exhorted him to be brave. "My son Symphorian, lose not sight of the God for whom you are dying; have Him always in your thoughts. Death is not to be feared when it leads to life. Look up to heaven, and let your heart follow your eyes thither; fix them upon Him who reigns above."

Throughout the third century Christianity was in the air throughout the Roman Empire, and not least in the court of the supreme rulers themselves. Gregory of Tours places in this period a mission of seven devoted men who spread themselves over Gaul. Modern historians attribute the origin of the work to Julianus, the saintly Bishop of Rome; but there is really no authority either for the mystic number or for the Roman mission.

A letter of S. Cyprian of Carthage, which belongs beyond controversy to the middle of the third century, proves that the Church of Southern Gaul was already deeply affected by the movements of the Christian world.

A certain bishop, Trophimus, had fallen from his profession in the persecution of Decius, and as he was deeply beloved, a number of his people had followed his example of weakness. He repented, however, and brought back with him those whom he had misled. But

a certain Marcianus, Bishop of Arles, maintained the Novatianist practice, and refused to recognise the repentant bishop. Upon this, S. Cyprian writes to Stephen, Bishop of Rome: "Faustinus, our colleague at Lyons, has told me, what I know has already been announced to you both by him and by other of our brother bishops in the same province, that Marcianus at Arles has joined Novatian and departed from the unity of the Catholic Church, and the consent of our body and our priesthood, holding the harsh and heretical doctrine that the comforts of divine pity and fatherly kindness must be refused to the servants of God, though they repent and wail and knock with tears and groaning for entrance to the Church. For such a state of things provision should be made by us, my dearest brother, who know the mercy of God, and hold the balance of Church government, and apply vigorous censure to the lapsed, yet in such a way as not to refuse the remedies of divine mercy. Therefore," proceeds the saint, "you ought to write very fully to our fellow-bishops in Gaul not to suffer Marcianus any further—this obstinate and proud Marcianus, enemy as he is of the divine pity and of his brother's salvation — to insult our Episcopal College. . . . Write letters to the province and to the people of Arles, in pursuance of which Marcianus may be excommunicated and another set in his place, and the flock of Christ hitherto scattered by him may be gathered again. For this end, my brother, the great body of bishops is united together by the bond of concord and the chain of unity, that if any of our college attempts to

promote a heresy and to tear and waste the body of Christ, the rest may come to give help, and, like efficient and compassionate pastors, may gather together the flock of the Lord."[1]

It is not recorded that Pope Stephen acted upon this recommendation. S. Cyprian's theory of Church unity, which represents the See of Rome as but member of a college, called upon as occasion may require to act for the rest, may have displeased the budding ambition of a pope; but Marcianus was somehow suppressed, for his name does not appear upon the diptychs of the Church of Arles.

This passage explains to us plainly the nature of the Church union of the time, and the discipline by which it was maintained; and it shows us the Church of France, at least in its southern parts, fully taking its position as a part of the Catholic Society.

The northern regions, though less thoroughly Latinised, cannot have been far behind, and it would be unreasonable to deny the general authenticity of the beautiful traditions of early Christianity in Northern Gaul which have been preserved. It is recorded by Gregory of Tours that some Christians in the third century penetrated to Bourges, where they preached to the people "Christ the Lord, the salvation of all men." A few were converted, and a native clergy ordained, who commenced the use of psalmody in worship, and consulted how they might erect a church to celebrate the mysteries in honour of God. Their hopes only reached to obtaining a private house; and having

[1] Ep. 67, ed. Baluze.

incurred some disappointments, because the wealthy men of the place were heathen, they had recourse to a citizen named Leocadius, who declared himself not unwilling to part with his house in Bourges for the purpose for which they needed it. They fell at his feet, and offered him, upon a silver dish, 300 pieces of gold, which was all they had been able to raise; but he took only three "for a blessing." His house became a church, and he himself a Christian. In Gregory's time it was the first church in Bourges, "honoured with the relics of the first martyr, S. Stephen, and constructed with wonderful workmanship." What would he have said if he could have beheld the splendid cathedral, one of the triumphs of French Gothic architecture, which stands now upon the site of the house of Leocadius?

SS. Crispin and Crispinian were two youths of noble birth, who, for the Gospel's sake, took up the occupation of shoemakers. Shakespeare's Henry V. anticipates that the battle of Agincourt, fought upon the day of their feast, will always be remembered along with it:—

> "Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
> From this day to the ending of the world,
> But we in it shall be remembered."

The story of S. Dionysius, as related by the earliest authorities, is a simple narrative of Christian heroism. He preached the Gospel in the middle of the third century, and was beheaded in the reign of Aurelian on the Mount of Mars, now Montmartre, where the French Christianity of our own day has erected a costly fane sorely inferior to the churches of the great

period. Legend transferred him to the Apostolic age, and identified him with the Areopagite converted by S. Paul. His martyrdom was adorned with the miraculous addition that after decapitation he carried his head in his hands. In the ninth century his name was attached (for the greater glory of the Abbey of S. Denys) to a wonderful collection of mystical writings which reached France from Constantinople.

The latter portion of the third century was a period of great social misery in Gaul, and the revolt of the Bagaudæ represented, in those late days of the Roman Empire, not a few of the features of the great French Revolution. The rich were too rich, and set no bounds to their selfish display, and the poor found in their despair the most formidable weapon against their oppressors.[1] To the same period belong the last persecutions of the Christians under the savage Maximian. To him is ascribed the massacre of the Theban Legion, which took place in Switzerland, but is connected with France by the circumstance that the martyred soldiers were marching against the insurgent Gallic peasantry. Popular imagination in after times supposed the Bagaudæ to have been Christians, and the soldiers to have been slain for refusing to attack their brethren. From a like impulse of popular sympathy, the last scene of the struggle of the Bagaudæ was regarded as a place of martyrdom; and when the Benedictines built a monastery upon the site, the bones which they disinterred received Christian burial, and the house was called the Monastery of the Moats.

[1] Martin, *Histoire de France*, vol. i. p. 280, 4th ed.

A change presents itself in the narratives of Christian suffering which the Acts of the Saints record in the concluding period of heathen rule as compared with earlier times. In the persecutions at Lyons under M. Aurelius, the populace appear as enemies of the accused, and express a cruel delight in their tortures. Not so in the later time. Then the work of blood is ascribed to some bloodthirsty and fanatical commander, and the sufferer, as in the history of the Theban Legion or the martyrdom of S. Victor, often belongs to the very soldiery under his command. Whether converted or not, the population at large have learnt to regard the Christians without enmity.

Gaul antedated, under the mild rule of Constantius Chlorus, the establishment of Christianity, which his son Constantine conferred upon the Empire at large. Persecution ceased, and the devastation which the rebellion of the Bagaudæ had caused was repaired. The restoration of the great city of Autun leads us to notice the high place which literary culture held in Gaul just when it was about to pass over to the rule of Christianity. In the renovated city a foundation for higher education arose which was not unworthy of comparison with the colleges of mediæval times. It was called, from the name of its founder, the Menian Schools, and was placed near to the temples of the highest deities of heathenism, in the hope that the gifts of art and culture might be connected with religion.

Eumenius, the eminent person whom Constantius placed at the head of this foundation, has preserved, with pardonable pride, the letter in which the offer was

made. It is a pleasing proof of the fatherly care of Constantius for his subjects, and of the high sense he entertained of the national intelligence. They well deserve, he says, that he should give them the best gifts of education that he can. What better thing could he give them than knowledge, which fortune can neither give nor take away, and what better imparter of knowledge could he appoint for them than Eumenius, who must not think that the practice of his professorship will derogate from his political honours and his favour at court. The salary was certainly calculated to honour the office, for it amounted to £5000 a year, which Eumenius devoted to the service of the town, especially the improvement of the school.

The accident of the destruction and restoration of these schools has alone preserved for us this record, in which no mention of Christianity occurs. But it serves to represent to us the condition of society on the eve of the fall of Paganism. The classic culture was not extinct, and the genius of adaptation which Christ's religion has ever displayed assures us that classic culture would be accepted and used by the faith.

The Christians of Gaul had practised the rites of their religion in freedom under the gentle connivance of Constantius. But his son Constantine restored their privileges by a public act. The march of this prince against the pagan Maxentius is called by a French historian the first Crusade. The warlike youth of Gaul flocked to the standard of Constantine with as much enthusiasm as their fathers three cen-

turies before had rallied to that of Julius Cæsar. But Constantine, as all knew, had elected to fight under the standard of the Cross. We cannot attribute to him an instructed or a devoted faith. But he knew that Christianity was the religion of the future, youthful and vigorous, while Paganism was effete; and though three-fourths of his army were heathens, they seem to have felt that Christ must prevail. In this holy war, as in so many which were to succeed it, Gaul led the van.

Constantine, only half a Christian himself, had soon to hold the balance between contending sects of Christians. As Gaul had been free from the persecutions which produced the Donatist schism, it was suggested to the Emperor that he should refer the Donatist question to bishops of that country. Accordingly, three Gallic prelates, Maternus of Cologne, Rheticius of Autun, and Marinus of Arles, were appointed together with some Italian bishops to hold a small Council in the palace of the Lateran at Rome, under the presidency of the Pope. They decided against the Donatists and censured their insubordination. But the schismatics refused to submit to the decision. A new Council was called at Arles, to which Constantine acted as convener, though carefully avoiding in his letter of summons the personal profession of Christianity. The Council was not of large dimensions, for only thirty-five prelates attended; but its decrees are of great interest, representing as they do the first use which the Church made of its new-found liberty, and conveying much information on the condition of

Christianity in Gaul. If the Emperor, in convening the Council, acted an Erastian part, the bishops display no tendency to frame their decisions by his opinions ; and their decrees concern all matters of Christian interest, without any thought of confining them to the Donatist sect, upon whose affairs they had been brought together.

The first canon ordains the cessation of all disputes and differences as to the time of Easter. The Bishop of Rome, according to the custom, is to announce the true date to all the Churches. The time had thus arrived at which the uniformity which Pope Victor had been reproved by S. Irenæus for enforcing could be secured in all charity. The second canon forbids clergy to leave the churches for which they had been ordained—a restriction which was sure to give way in a more developed condition of the ecclesiastical system. The third, fourth, and fifth excommunicate gladiators, drivers in the public chariot races, and actors. The corruption of these classes of people far exceeded any that belongs to the corresponding classes among ourselves. The sixth permits the imposition of hands upon those who in sickness desire to become believers. If this means the imposition of hands which followed baptism, and which corresponds to our confirmation, the permission to baptize the sick man is implied. The eighth indicates a condition of partial reconciliation of Church and State, but not without suspicion. It ordains that officers appointed to public functions are to be received by Christian prelates on presenting letters of commendation from the bishops of the place from which they

came, and it is only when they actually infringe the discipline of the Church that they are to be excluded from communion. This is a relaxation of the practice enjoined by the Synod of Elvira held nine years before, while the State was yet heathen; but it is certainly far from exhibiting any subservience to the Emperor on the part of the bishops who sat at Arles.

In the eighth canon the question of the re-baptism of heretics is determined against the principle for which the great S. Cyprian had contended. The Council held to the belief that baptism, being the direct gift of Christ, is not invalidated by the heresy of the person who administers it. The ninth directs Christians who obtain letters of recommendation when going on a journey to content themselves with being introduced as plain Christians, instead of seeking the admiration of the simple by having themselves described as confessors.

The next canon touches a question of the present day. In cases where divorce has been granted by the civil law on the ground of the misconduct of the wife, the Church is to use every exertion to prevent the husband marrying again. This language would not lead us to suppose that if, in spite of this advice, he did marry again, the penalty of excommunication would be used. Christian maidens who marry heathen husbands are for a time to be repelled from communion. Clergymen who lend on usury are to be excommunicated, and those who have surrendered the books or sacred vessels of their churches in time of persecution are to be deposed from their orders. But no question is to

be raised as to the validity of orders received from bishops who have fallen into these offences. An accusation of the kind is not to be received without proof from the public records. False accusers are to be excommunicated to the very day of their death. Deacons who in the time of persecution had taken upon them to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, when the bishops and priests had been driven away, are prohibited from continuing the practice. Those who have been excommunicated are not to be again received to communion except in the church in which they were expelled from it. Bishops are forbidden to interfere with the functions of their brother prelates. Town deacons—who may be presumed to be more likely to exalt themselves than their simple brethren in the country—are bidden to observe their proper subjection to their priests. A single bishop is not to be permitted to consecrate another. Seven, if possible, but at the very least three, are to take part in every consecration. The last of the canons which are undoubtedly genuine, directs that apostates who have refused to repent until the time of sickness must still be repelled from communion, unless they should recover and display a changed life. This restriction was relaxed by the Council of Nicæa.

The canons of Arles display to us the condition of the Church before yet the temptations and difficulties of establishment had impaired her purity. The primitive discipline is still effective. At the same time, we see well that it is impossible all the rules which the Church enforced in times when her numbers

were comparatively small, and her life simple, should last into the period when she should have gathered into her bounds all sorts and conditions of men.

Gaul was confided in the early years of Constantine to the government of his eldest son, Crispus, now a promising youth of twenty. This young prince was put to death by his father, and this event contributed much to the loss of Constantine's early popularity in Gaul. He never visited that country during the last decade of his life. In truth, the first Christian emperor grew more of a tyrant as his life proceeded, and the East was a more pleasing residence to him than the free air of Gaul.

Among all the blessings which the Gallic Church received in the fourth century, the greatest was its general exemption from Arianism. It was to this circumstance that it owed the visit of the great Athanasius, whom Constantine deported to Treves, whether with the kindly intention of putting him out of harm's way in an orthodox land, or for the purpose of setting him in a place where he would find no enemies to contend with. The illustrious teacher was hospitably received in his Western retreat, where he spent two years and a half. During this period Constantine the Great died, and Athanasius was released by the younger Constantine, who forwarded to the Christians of Alexandria a letter which gives a favourable notion of his disposition towards his saintly prisoner.

When Constantius reunited his father's empire in A.D. 351, Gaul became subject to an Arian ruler, and a mean and cruel one. So little did he regard the

lives of his subjects, that, to ensure the defeat of his rivals, he invited the Germans over the Rhine. To this period apparently the invasion of King Chrocus belongs — a time of which shuddering recollections appear in the traditions of various dioceses. The destruction of venerable edifices was his special delight, and he hoped to make himself famous by pulling down what others had laboured to build. Falling into the hands of his enemies, this monster was exhibited in a cage, and at last put to death with torture.

Constantius had the despot's ambition to prescribe doctrine to the Church. He was thus the natural enemy of Athanasius, and included in his dislike the bishops of Gaul, with whom the Egyptian Patriarch stood in friendly relations. Coming from the East, where a Council was the ready resort of a spiritual tyrant, he proceeded to summon one at Arles, which should be under his own eye. On its assemblage, the members found themselves presented with a condemnation of Athanasius ready drawn for signature. Most of the prelates, the legates of Pope Liberius among the rest, suffered themselves to be drawn into this gross injustice, upon the promise of being afterwards allowed to discuss and condemn Arianism. The champion of the faith was condemned, but the discussion of the faith itself, which was the promised equivalent, was never allowed to proceed. Pope Liberius repudiated his representatives. The only man who came out of the business with credit was Paulinus, Bishop of Treves, who refused to condemn Athanasius, and was exiled

by Constantius into Phrygia. Dragged from place to place, the good bishop died of fatigue and sorrow in the year 358. It was an evil time. The great Hosius himself was induced to sanction heresy; but Athanasius spoke gently of the fall of an old friend, who in extreme age and weakness gave way for a moment. To this period belongs also the fall of Pope Liberius, who yielded, however, only to a long exile and to the threat of death.

But though the occupant of the See of Rome was ever a person of great official importance in the eyes of the Western Church, the most influential leader of theological thought at this time was the bishop of a Gaulish town. In S. Hilary of Poitiers the Church of Gaul possessed the greatest Latin divine of his day. The profound German writer, Dorner, is of opinion that though S. Hilary be "one of the most difficult Church teachers to understand, he is also one of the most original and profound. His view of Christology is one of the most interesting in the whole of Christian antiquity." [1]

This fact may be the result or the sign of the process by which Hilary had found his way from heathenism into the faith. It was a theological process, and its first step was the recognition of the unity of God as revealed in the Old Testament. He saw that we are placed in this world for trial and education, and longed intensely to know the Divine Being who set us here. And in the words, "I am that I am," and "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?" he found an answer

[1] Dorner on the Person of Christ, Eng. trans., vol. ii. p. 399.

altogether more satisfying than any which heathenism gave. And then he says that he extended his desires further, and reached forth to a future life. He longed that his good thoughts about God, and the good life he desired to build on them, might have an eternal reward. But his sense of personal weakness filled him with despair, until the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles gave him a hope beyond what he ever could have conceived; especially the Gospel of S. John, where he found that God has a Son co-eternal with Himself, and that this Son, the Word of God, had become flesh in order that man might become the son of God.

S. Hilary was a man of enlarged mind, and did not suffer his classical culture to become dull, but retained it for use in Christ's service. Nor was he a recluse. He had married before his conversion, and had the happiness to bring with him to baptism his wife and their only child, Abra. From the time that the people of his native town selected him for their bishop, he ceased to live with his wife. It was the custom of the time, though observed more strictly in some countries than in others.

Hilary had not attended the Synod of Arles. But this was neither from fear nor from want of interest in the danger to which the faith was exposed by the heresy of Constantius. For he addressed a letter to that prince which, handed about and copied, aroused all the interest which a successful pamphlet might do at the present day. It was a bold remonstrance upon the shameful use of force by which the heretic Emperor

pushed his opinions, and it is for the honour of the Gallic Church to be able to say that S. Hilary reprobated cruelty not merely because it was on the wrong side. He lays down with great distinctness the true theory of toleration, and repudiates the employment of force on the side of truth as well as of falsehood. "God has taught us rather than compelled us to the knowledge of Himself; and while by the wonders of His heavenly operations He gives authority to His commands, He despises that will to acknowledge Him which is merely constrained. If this kind of compulsion were exercised in behalf of the true faith, the teaching authority of the bishops would be exerted in opposition to it, and would declare that the Lord of the universe has no need of a worship which is compelled, or a confession extracted by force." Would that the bishops of the Church of France in later times had been true to these principles, so clearly laid down by one of the greatest of their number. S. Hilary's doctrine was the result of his personal experience. For though in the zeal of his first conversion he had been used to abstain from intercourse with Jews and heathen, he afterwards learned that it was better to meet them freely, using the opportunity for the good of the faith. But Hilary displayed no want of decision as a leader. He expelled from communion Saturninus of Arles and two other prelates as the true authors of the persecution. Saturninus, smarting under this blow, gathered a Council at Beziers, where Hilary, with some other orthodox bishops, thought it their duty to attend, and strove in vain to procure a confirmation of

the declaration of Sardica in favour of Athanasius. Hilary's labours for truth were interrupted by his exile to the East. But the exile of the leader implied no relaxation of discipline among his followers during his absence. The bishops stood firm, and refused to accept communion with Saturninus, while Hilary, in the distant place of his exile, had no small opportunity of helping the cause of truth among the contending opinions of the East. The West, instead of being the very home of divisions, as is now the case, was comparatively at one; while the East, instead of being orthodox even to deadness, was teeming with various subtleties.

S. Hilary had been a year in exile before the good news of the steadfastness of his Gallic friends arrived to comfort his heart. It came accompanied by a request upon their part for information concerning the various creeds and symbols which swarmed in the East, to the perplexity of their simpler minds; and the book "Of the Synods," in which Hilary essayed the task, enables us to understand the different points of view from which the subject was regarded, and to perceive the essential divergence of the Eastern and Western mind, which already presaged the great schism. Any one who supposes that the controversies about the divine nature were matter of words, may convince himself of the contrary by reading this treatise. Hilary makes the most ample allowance for the different senses in which the terms of the controversy may be used, and warns his readers of the error which may be conveyed by the most orthodox

language, and of the truths which may underlie the least correct.

We can see that the difficult theological questions into which Hilary enters were irksome to the Gallic prelates, and he finds it necessary to prove to them that, however much one may desire to fall back upon the accredited terminology of the Church and eschew attempts to explain, there are occasions when this will not answer. On the other hand, nothing seems to him more dishonest than to set aside the terms of the Church's creed on account of a possible false sense which might be attributed to them. For instance, it is unjustifiable to reject the term "of one substance," as applied to the persons of the Godhead, because it might be taken to assert a pre-existent substance out of which both Divine Persons were made.

Hilary's adoption of the Nicene expressions is the more impressive because he is able to declare that he never heard of them until long after his baptism, and when he had been for some time a bishop. They came to him as just what was wanted to express the truth which he had before believed on the ground of Scripture and the apostolical tradition. These facts enable us to realise the separation both in place and quality of mind which existed between the Gallic Church and the great Oriental controversies, and at the same time convince us that it was impossible for any part of the Church to keep out of the dispute once it had been raised.

CHAPTER II.

DIVINES AND SAINTS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

The Council of Ariminum—Return of Hilary—S. Martin of Tours—Gallic Monasticism—Cassian—S. Honoratus and Lerins—S. Hilary of Arles and Pope Gregory—Semi-Pelagianism—Vincentius of Lerins—Faustus of Riez.

EVENTS speedily ensued which warranted Hilary's anxiety that the Gallic bishops should study the Arian controversy. Constantius determined to summon a Council for the purpose of uniting the various sections of Arianism against the orthodox creed. Nicomedia was first contemplated as the place of meeting, but the destruction of that great city by an earthquake compelled a change, and the bishops were summoned to assemble at Nicæa. Another change in the Emperor's mind, or in the plans of those who influenced him, occurred while the bishops were on their way, and they were ordered to remain, each in the place in which he might be, till further commands. This uncivil command shows the spirit in which the parties in power were disposed to treat the Church. At the same time, they were not devoid of fear of the effects of a general assembly of the bishops. There were a large number of Semi-Arians who, while perplexed in some of the subtleties of the question, were innocent of heretical intentions. Such men were always regarded with

much charity and allowance by leaders like Athanasius and Hilary, and there was good reason to apprehend that they might in a Council pass over to the orthodox.

The Emperor was a Semi-Arian himself, but he was in the hands of advisers whose opinions were more advanced. And the plan which finally approved itself to them was to hold two Synods, one for the West at Ariminum, and the other for the East at Seleucia. The first was that to which the Gallic bishops naturally resorted. But Hilary, the leading spirit of them all, was still in his Phrygian exile. He received no command from the Emperor to attend at Seleucia, but the imperial functionaries summoned him thither in the exercise of the general direction under which they acted.

The Synod of Ariminum was the first to assemble, and it included the imposing number of more than 400 prelates. The Emperor had ordered their expenses to be paid from the public treasury, but the only bishops who availed themselves of the offer were three very poor ones from Britain, who had but the choice of dependence on the Emperor or on their brethren.

The Council, upon its assemblage, was presented with a formula of faith ready prepared by the Arians. It had been composed at Sirmium, a place which was prolific in the manufacture of creeds, and it bore the following title, which would be hard to match in Erastianism either from Gallican or Anglican examples: "The Catholic faith was defined, in the presence of our master, the religious and victorious Emperor Constantius, eternally venerable." It stated God the Son to be "like the Father who has begotten Him conformably

to Holy Scripture, whose generation none can comprehend except the Father who begat Him; but as the word 'substance' employed by our fathers in their simplicity has been misunderstood, and is not found in Scripture, it has been determined to set it aside." The Emperor's advisers counted upon deceiving the Western prelates, whose simplicity they regarded with contempt, into the acceptance of this form.

But in this they were mistaken. The bishops replied that there was no need of new definitions; the Council of Nicæa had done everything that was necessary. The pressing matter was to condemn Arianism and to convict its advocates. The doctrinal decisions of Nicæa were therefore adopted unanimously, including the phrase "of the same substance;" and six heretical bishops, including two of the Emperor's closest advisers, were deposed. The Emperor had directed that ten members of the Synod should report its results to him, and that in case of a difference between the Eastern and Western assemblies, these deputations should carry on a discussion in his presence. The deputation from Ariminum had but an unwelcome result to announce. Moreover, the Arian party remaining on the condemnation of the leaders had appointed its own deputation, consisting of far more wily courtiers than the Catholics.

The Arians had the first interview with the Emperor, and filled him with resentment at the rejection of a formula approved by himself. The Catholic envoys obtained no audience, but were directed to repair to Adrianople and wait until affairs of state should permit

the great man to examine their cause. The bishops still in session at Ariminum were warned not to leave until their delegates should return. The unhappy deputation were carried into Thrace, where, under arguments, deceptions, threats, and force, they subscribed a formulary which differed little from that of Sirmium, and they consented to communicate with Arians. With this document in their hands, they returned to Ariminum accompanied by the heretical bishops. They alleged in their excuse the violence used against them by the Emperor; and the same usage was unsparingly threatened against the whole assembly. The prefect had orders to exile fifteen of the most obstinate bishops in case of resistance; the court issued a violent edict demanding the rejection of the word "substance" as not found in Scripture; and the heretical bishops urged that it was cruel to break the peace of the Church for a term which the Bible did not use. We can hardly wonder that the majority melted away.

Among the twenty who stood their ground to the last was a Gallic bishop, Phœbadius of Agen. It was useless to try threats or even violence upon him, but he and his fellows fell victims to a pretended offer of concession. Our opinion of their theological acuteness is not raised when we learn that they accepted some specious additions to the forms which the delegates had signed, and among them one which declared that the Son was not a creature as other creatures, without perceiving that the words themselves pronounce Him a created being. By this means it came to pass that

the assembly dissolved amidst mutual congratulations and universal joy; and it was only the rejoicings of the Arians that revealed to the Catholics the true import of what they had done. The word "substance" had been put out of sight, and the Nicene faith was repealed among the acclamations of its friends. "The whole world," in the words of S. Jerome, "groaned and wondered to find itself Arian."

The Eastern Synod at Seleucia was far less Catholic in its composition than that of Ariminum. But the Gallic Church was more strongly represented by Hilary alone than by the larger number in the Western Council. He was received with honour as representing so great a nation. His statement of the doctrine of the Church to which he belonged was respectfully received, and he was solemnly admitted to communion by the assembly: nor did he scruple to communicate with the Semi-Arians. There was much wrangling; but the result of four days' discussion was that the extreme Arians were isolated through the coalition of the other parties. The deputation of ten was sent to the Emperor, and Hilary accompanied them on his own account. As in the case of the other Council, the Arians were the first to gain the Emperor's ear; and the representatives from Seleucia were compelled, much against their own will, to subscribe the formula from Ariminum. The appearance of unity thus gained was imposing, but it was felt even at the time to be unreal.

This opinion is expressed in the proceedings of a Synod which met in Paris in A.D. 360 or 361. It pro-

claimed that, in consenting to omit the term "substance" at Ariminum, the simplicity of the bishops had been practised on, and as Hilary, "that faithful preacher of the name of the Lord," has informed them of the conduct which the deputies had held at Constantinople, the Synod repudiates and excommunicates them.

Hilary therefore had returned to Gaul. In fact, he had made himself so formidable to the Arians at Constantinople by challenging them to public discussions, that the Emperor was glad to get rid of him. Before his departure he composed a work "against Constantius the Emperor," which in its fierce denunciation contrasts strongly with his other writings. He had been witness to the miserable system of bullying and fraud which the Emperor adopted in his theological campaign.

The encounter between the vigorous Julian and the incapable Constantius was terminated without a battle by the sudden death of the latter. Gallic Church history only knows Julian as a professing Christian. He celebrated the Epiphany at Vienne after his march against Constantius had begun; and in leaving the country which he had ruled for seven years with excellent temper and strict justice, he suffered a change in character sorely for the worse. Hilary devoted the rest of his life to the destruction of Western Arianism. His efforts extended not only to his native Gaul, but he undertook, with Eusebius of Vercelli, a prolonged mission to Italy. He appeared to some to display culpable laxity in receiving to communion those who had been betrayed into subscribing unsound formulæ;

And he nobly protested against the use of secular force in religious controversy. "Now," he says, "sad to relate, earthly support is invited for divine faith. The Church intimidates by means of exile and prison —she who used to attract faith by the exile and prisons which she endured."

There is no trace of any authority extended to Hilary by Pope Liberius for his Italian mission: nor does that prelate seem to have taken part in any of the Synods which the Gallic evangelist held in Italy. He was expelled from that country by the Emperor Valentinian, and spent his latter days in the care of his diocese. What time could be spared from active work was devoted to writings, hymnody, even to copying the Holy Scriptures. He died at Poitiers in A.D. 367 or 368, leaving behind such a record as few even in the great history of the Church of Gaul have excelled.

S. Hilary had a pupil whose biography is as valuable for the light it throws upon the progress of the evangelical life, as that of the master is in the history of theology. S. Martin was not Gallic by birth. The son of a pagan, he was born in Pannonia, and brought up without education. But at ten years old he became, in his parents' despite, a catechumen at Pavia. Monasticism was a passion of the time, and the boy formed the purpose of an ascetic life. But at sixteen he was obliged, as the son of a veteran, to enter the army, and he was quartered as a cavalry officer in Gaul. His military career reminds us of the lives of Christian soldiers of our own days; he was extremely popular with his comrades, but led the life rather of

a monk than a trooper. His habits had an ascetic tinge not to be found in the religious biographies of modern times, and miracles hold the place which conscious experiences of inward dealings with God occupy in the recent lives. But the type of character is the same.

The military life was not congenial to Martin, and he obtained his discharge from the Cæsar, Julian. Hilary had just been made Bishop of Poitiers, and the young enthusiast was attracted by his fame. It had long been Hilary's wish to establish a monastery in Gaul, and he realised the project by assigning to Martin a site six miles from Poitiers, where he might live the life he so ardently desired. We must not imagine Martin's monastery a great building such as after ages were wont to erect. He lived in a wooden hut, and eighty companions gathered round him, some in habitations like his, and some in the caves of the river-bank. "There no one possessed anything of his own. Everything was cast into a common stock. It was unlawful to buy or sell anything, as most monks are wont to do. No art was exercised save that of the scribe, and the young monks were assigned to that work, while the elder devoted themselves to prayer. It was rare that any should leave his cell, except when they assembled at the place of worship. All took food together when the hour of the fast was over. No one knew the taste of wine except in sickness. Most were clothed in camel's hair; soft clothing was counted a crime. And this was the more wonderful in that many among them had been ranked among nobles, and,

though brought up in a very different fashion, had constrained themselves to this humiliation and suffering. We have since seen most of them bishops. For what town or church was there that did not desire a bishop out of Martin's monastery?" So writes Sulpicius Severus.

Martin himself furnished the first instance of the popular desire to obtain bishops from his community. A vacancy having occurred at Tours, the people of that place fixed their hearts on Martin, but it required a pious fraud to entice him from his retreat. A citizen pretended that his sick wife desired to see the saint, who on coming forth was handed over to the custody of the crowd. Consecration to the episcopate made no change in his personal habits, but he discharged the duties of his office with all authority.

Many of the narratives of his life, full of miracles though they are, furnish us with curious traits of the time or indications of the attractive character of the saint; as when Satan reproached him with the past evil lives of some of his monks, and cast doubt upon their forgiveness, Martin replied, "If thou thyself, wretched one, wilt cease from tempting men, and repent of thy deeds even now, when the day of judgment is near, I should have confidence enough in the Lord Jesus Christ to promise thee mercy." The character which Sulpicius describes in S. Martin is a saintly one, and yet very life-like. "No one ever saw him angry, or moved, or weeping, or laughing. He was ever the same, displaying in his countenance a kind of heavenly joy which was more than human. Never on his lips

was anything but Christ; never in his heart anything but pity, peace, and compassion." But he was capable of sturdy independence; and this was manifested, as became a disciple of S. Hilary, in opposition to the use of the temporal power against the Priscillianist heretics. He never ceased to dissuade Maximus from staining himself with the blood of these men. He protested "that it was sufficient, and more than sufficient, that the heretics, judged by the sentence of the bishops, should be expelled from their churches; it was a cruel and unheard-of piece of wickedness that a secular judge should decide upon an ecclesiastical offence." As long as Martin was at Treves the business was adjourned, and on departing he obtained from Maximus a promise that there should be no bloodshed. But the bad advice of other bishops induced the Emperor to break his word. The worst effects followed. Priscillianism spread widely; and a spirit of contention was aroused among the Gallic prelates themselves, which called their attention away from their proper work to that of controversy.

Martin lived to the great age of eighty-one, and upon his death a contention arose between Poitiers and Tours for the possession of his body. It was determined in favour of Tours by the energy of its agents, who entered the cell through a window while the guard from Poitiers were asleep, and carried off the sacred remains. The biographer gives a sound reason why Martin should not be compared with cremites and anchorets: "They were free from outward hindrance, and did wonderful things, with none

but Heaven and the angels to witness. But he, in the midst of the crowd and bustle of the people, among quarrelling clergy and raging bishops, with almost daily scandals pressing round him, yet took his stand upon his immovable virtue, and performed things which no eremite could attain to."

The monastic system was at this time spreading widely in Gaul, but we notice in the fathers of Western monasticism an abiding sense of their inferiority to the hermits and anchorets of Egypt. Yet, however much Gallic Christians may have regretted that their climate or their constitutions forbad living on the top of a pillar, there was little reason why they should be ashamed of it. Even the less extravagant asceticism which vast troops of religious carried out in Egypt was, so far as we can see, of less use to the Church than the milder rule of the monasteries of Gaul. We do not read in the history of Gallic controversy of the intervention of bodies of fanatic monks, deaf to pity and to argument, such as too often appeared in the East.

However, the south of Gaul witnessed a large introduction of the Egyptian system. The agent in effecting this was the celebrated John Cassian. Severe as the life and useful as the work of the communities which gathered round S. Martin and S. Victricius may have been, they were doubtless deficient in system when compared with that which arose under Cassian at Marseilles, and in many other houses which were speedily established in imitation of his work.

It is uncertain whether Cassian himself was a native

of the East or of Gaul. He writes Latin like a mother tongue, but it is certain that all his experience was gathered among the Oriental monks, and chiefly in Egypt. The system which he drew up for his Gallic establishments was not only used in the monasteries which had their origin with him, but was studied, though not always imitated, by the many Orders which formed so essential a part of Gallic religion.

The Egyptians, according to Cassian, wear a linen inner garment, and an outer of coarse stuff. Camels-hair might be worn within, but not displayed. The feet were naked, except in sickness or very cold weather.

The practice of Tabenna in Egypt, where five thousand monks lived under the government of an abbot, is recounted as a model of the manner of reception and training. The aspirant was obliged to wait for ten days at the gate, and upon entrance surrendered all his worldly goods, even to his clothes. The latter were kept for him, in case of expulsion or voluntary departure; but the property of which he divested himself was not made over to the monastery, lest he should be elevated with pride for having conferred a benefit. He lodged under the care of an old monk in a special habitation for a year, and then was associated with the order, and placed under the care of a decanus, an official whose title, familiar to us in the form of dean, was derived from the ten monks whom he drilled. Exact obedience was the principle of the whole training. To mortify the will was the sufficient reason for the imposition of tasks otherwise useless. Every

thought of the heart was to be communicated to the decanus; and for any one to speak even of the garments he wore as his was a crime to be severely punished. "What," exclaims Cassian, "shall we miserable Westerns say to this?—we who, though living in monasteries and under the rule of an abbot, carry about our own keys, and treading under foot the sense of shame due to our profession, do not hesitate to carry openly on our fingers signet-rings to seal up the hidden treasures which not merely our boxes, but even our presses are insufficient to contain." The crime of possessing anything took its place with that of eating out of hours or talking with a female. All these were greater offences, punishable by personal chastisement or expulsion. Manual labour was the monk's remedy for the vice of laziness, and we gain a high opinion of Cassian's knowledge of human nature when he writes: "Vanity never is more obstinate than when it seems most mortified. When we feel ourselves dead to the world, vanity finds in that very death itself a new force and life." Among the incentives to vanity which a monk is to avoid is the company of bishops. Episcopal houses and episcopal service were ever a snare of monks both in early and in later times.

The life of S. Honoratus was one of the first and one of the most devoted instances of the monastic spirit. We possess an account of it in a sermon by his successor, S. Hilary of Arles. It compels our admiration for the faith and for the Church which could produce such characters. He was of consular

family, a distinction then counted among the highest. By his own desire he sought and received baptism in early youth, and he was converted—such is the expression which had begun to be applied to the adoption of a monastic life—while the brightness of the font was fresh upon him. With an elder brother, who was partaker in his calling, he visited Greece, which was then to the Gallic traveller a place as barren and barbarous as Gaul had been to the Greeks of past times. The brother died, and Honoratus returned to find some desert place in which to fix his abode. He found it on the isle on the coast of Provence known afterwards through the whole Christian world under the name of Lerinum or Lerins, of the monastery of which Honoratus was the founder. The cells soon began to multiply. Soon there was not a nation which was not represented in the sacred colony.

The people of Arles forced their bishopric upon Honoratus, as those of Tours did upon S. Martin. Hilary, his successor, can call his auditors to witness the anxiety, the piety, the carefulness in discipline and the charity which made some one say, that were he to depict charity itself, it should be embodied in the picture of Honoratus. Three years of episcopal labour wore out his frame, and a sermon on the Epiphany was his last public work. On his deathbed he remembered with some word or message every one of his monks and the chief people of the town. There are no miracles in the life of Honoratus, as Hilary gives it to us, except the miracle of a Christian life, so often repeated before and since, but never in more striking form.

Though founded before the time of Cassian, Lerins received the lessons of his experience with gratitude. But his ideal of a monastery involved a total separation from all diocesan engagements. The spirit of the Gallic Church and the necessities of the times forbad such a severance from Church work. His monasteries were schools and training places for labourers in the Gospel. Even Cassian's own foundation at Marseilles was forced in the course of time to assume this character; but during his life it maintained the principles of pure monasticism, and five thousand monks lived in it either as cœnobites within the walls or as anchorets in the cells around.

S. Hilary of Arles, of whose funeral sermon on S. Honoratus we have spoken, was himself the noblest figure in the Gallic Church of his time. In self-denial and piety he was the worthy successor of Honoratus, whilst his physical vigour and the length of his episcopate enabled him to leave a still more permanent mark upon his diocese. We discern in him a tendency to independence in respect to Rome, and a similar willingness to question the overbearing authority of the great Augustine. The latter tendency seems to have been a tradition of Lerins and of the Gallic Church itself at this period.

The rights of the See of Arles to the primacy of Gallia Narbonensis had been recognised by Rome. In pursuance of these rights, Hilary deposed the Bishop of Besançon for marrying a widow, and for other canonical defects. The Bishop appealed to Rome, and the Pope, no less a person than the great S. Leo, decided

the case without rehearing it, and restored the appellant. Hilary repaired to Rome in midwinter to complain, and was there thrown into prison by Leo. He escaped and returned to Gaul, and for this offence was excommunicated by the Pope, and his see was deprived of its primatial rights. Hilary refused obedience, and took his stand upon the law of the Church; but the Pope, in reply, obtained from the Emperor a rescript to Aetius, the commander in Gaul, which "decrees by this perpetual edict that it shall not be lawful for the bishops of Gaul, or of the other provinces, contrary to ancient custom, to do anything without the authority of the Eternal City: and whatever the authority of the Apostolic See has enacted, or may hereafter enact, shall be the law for all." Hilary never submitted, and, though recognised as a saint, and styled "of blessed memory" by S. Leo himself, he seems to have died under the Roman excommunication.

The questions of Divine grace and human free-will naturally succeeded the controversies upon the Divine nature, for the relations of God to man in the Gospel flow from His being and power. Yet it was not in the East, where the nature of the person of Christ had been so long discussed, that the heresy of Pelagianism arose, but in the West; and while the Gallic bishops found it hard to comprehend the Oriental subtleties regarding the person of the Saviour, we find no such backwardness in the Pelagian debates. The Gallic theologians of the time were for the most part semi-Pelagian. They believed in the absolute necessity of Divine grace for the religious life; but they could not persuade themselves

that the very first impulse towards God in the soul was not attributable to an act of the man. Two treatises of the great Augustine are directed against this modified Pelagianism. He treats the divines who propounded it with respect, and clears them entirely of the pride and self-dependence with which Pelagianism is tainted. Yet he will not allow that any language can express the extent of our insufficiency except that which ascribes to God the very first beginning as well as the progress and result of the divine life within us.

The unwillingness of the Roman See to involve itself in this controversy was conspicuous in the fifth century as in the seventeenth. Pope Cœlestine's response to the appeals made to him on the question is but a general direction to regard authority and antiquity.

But both authority and antiquity could be quoted on the one side as well as the other. It is as an appeal to antiquity on the part of the Gallic divines that the *Commonitorium* of Vincentius of Lerins was composed. The principle that Catholics should hold and practise what has been taught always, everywhere and by all, was undoubtedly supposed by him to justify semi-Pelagianism. Vincentius does not contemplate the possibility of Rome assuming the power to define doctrines unheard of by the primitive Church. Like Irenæus, he valued her authority as that of the see which has been most faithful to antiquity and the sturdiest opponent of novelties. But a tinge of humour is discernible in the reference which Vincentius makes to the cautious response of Pope Cœlestine: "Here, perhaps, some one may raise a doubt who those are whom

he forbids to talk as they will, whether the preachers of ancient doctrine or the inventors of novelty."

Another eminent inmate of Lerins of whose semi-Pelagian opinions there can be no doubt is Faustus, Abbot of the monastery, and afterwards Bishop of Riez. He is believed to have been born in Britain, and, curiously enough, a sermon of his upon the Holy Eucharist is quoted in one of the Homilies of the Church of England under the erroneous name of "Emissenus, a godly father."

The preaching of Faustus was celebrated, but he possessed a severe nature, which he inherited from his mother, if we may believe in the genuineness of the terror which the old lady inspired in the genial Sidonius Apollinaris. This tendency may account for his semi-Pelagianism, of which his two books on Grace and Free-will leave no doubt. His definition of his doctrine in relation to Pelagianism is that Pelagius thinks he can do without grace, while Faustus and his friends "join free-will to grace." Faustus was long dead before his unsoundness in doctrine was pronounced, and the reputation as a saint which he possessed in his own province tempered the censure with much hesitation on the part of the authorities; but nothing at all was ever said in censure of a tenet of his which many would now consider far more dangerous than semi-Pelagianism. He maintained in controversy with Mamertus Claudius that the soul is material.

M. Guizot regards this controversy as illustrating the strange condition of intellectual life in the fifth century, when the philosophies of the ancient world were

all breaking up, and what remained of their spirit and stores of thought found a refuge in the Christian Church. It was a condition which bore some resemblance to the Renaissance, and it was best exemplified in Gaul, which in the fifth century showed more intellectual activity and more classic learning than either Italy or Spain. This was due to the comparative peace which it enjoyed, and to the prevalence of the Greek language in large regions of the country. Even in the sixth century many persons in the congregations found it easier to sing the hymns in Greek than in Latin.

S. Augustine, in opposition to the opinion of some early Fathers, maintained the soul to be immaterial; and Mamertus, with much ability of style and argument, upholds the same opinion, on the grounds not so much of Scripture as philosophy. Faustus holds that God alone is pure spirit. The dispute was conducted without acrimony, and Sidonius Apollinaris remained equally the friend of both the combatants.

CHAPTER III.

THE COMING OF THE FRANKS.

S. Eucherius—Salvian—The mission of SS. Germanus and Lupus—The letters of Sidonius Apollinaris—SS. Avitus and Cæsarius—Fall of the Roman dominion—The place of the bishop under the rule of the Franks.

AMONG the saintly bishops who in the terrible fifth century prepared the Church to convert her conquerors, there is none more attractive to us than Eucherius of Lyons. He was a man of noble birth, who had lived in the world and held office under the Empire. He was married, and had two sons; but, while still in the flower of his age, he determined to forsake the world, and took refuge in the island of Lero, now Ste. Marguerite, close to Lerins. His literary works belong chiefly to this period of retirement, and his two boys, Salonius and Veranius, were carefully brought up in the monastery under the tutorship of the celebrated Salvian and Vincentius, and both of them afterwards attained the episcopal office. His treatise "In Praise of the Desert," addressed to S. Hilary of Arles, suffices to show us how the monastic life seized the imagination of the best men of the time. Among all Hilary's merits there is not one which Eucherius prizes so highly as his longing after the life of the solitary. "Where can one better than in the desert experience

how sweet the Lord is?" "I do reverence to all desert places, the retreats of pious men; but I embrace with special honour my Lerins, which receives in its kindly arms those whom the shipwrecks of a stormy world have scattered abroad."

S. Eucherius, like S. Augustine, marked the hand of God in the growth of the Roman Empire, and the foundation which it laid for the city of God. "The earth from east to west resounds with the name of Christ: all quarters of the world crowd into It to seek life: and the Thracian, the Lybian, the Syrian, the Spaniard, receive the faith. Now that we are in the eleven hundred and eighty-fifth year from the beginning of this empire, we can show that every nation which during that long period was added either by kings or consuls to the Roman dominion was thereby prepared for the coming of Christ." But now, he thinks, the world is coming to its close. It totters with age, and cannot bear its burdens; its last term is filled with disorders like the last portion of an old man's life. Famines, pestilences, devastations, wars, and terrors have been seen, and still shall be seen, in this hoary time. The death of the world presses upon us as if the approach of our own death was not enough, and so he invites his friends to take up the monastic life. "Come, and from the ocean of your earthly life look to the safe port of our profession, and turn your prow thitherwards. This is the one harbour into which we can be carried from the tossings of this heaving age, and find a refuge from the storms of the world: here should all flee who are harassed by the

tempests of the time." The saint did not know that another world was to arise among those very people that were now assailing the gates of the Empire, and that Christianity was to develop resources of help and guidance among civilisations far more full of culture, and societies far more highly organised, than any which Rome had produced.

At the call of the people of Lyons, Eucherius forsook his beloved desert to be their prelate, and this lover of solitude became the most devoted bishop of his day.

The name of Salvian has been mentioned as the preceptor of the sons of S. Eucherius, but he is better known still by the awful picture which his own works give us of the condition of Christian society when the invasion of the barbarians was beginning. He describes to us the heartless luxury in which the wealthy Romans lived, while everywhere around them the track of the barbarian invaders was marked by poverty and misery. His book "On the Government of God" was written a short time after the defeat of Liberius by the Goths and the sack of Carthage by the Vandals, both which disasters happened in the year A.D. 439. These calamities had driven many people to think that God took no more care of human affairs. Salvian replies by reminding them how many joys God gives us which the loss of all earthly blessings cannot take away; but a bolder answer still, and one which his indignant spirit uses with greater eloquence, is the terrible assertion that the most dreadful misfortunes of the time are God's chastisements, well merited by the sins of

civilisation and of the Church itself. The great men, he complains, use their dignity only for oppression; the poor have nothing worse to fear from any rulers than what their governors already inflict. Cursing and swearing were universal among rich and poor alike, but impurity was the worst among all the many sins which prevailed. The households of the Gallic gentry are depicted to us as almost without exception abodes of vice, in which it was impossible for any woman, even if she desired it, to remain untainted.

Treves was repeatedly sacked by the barbarians, but the people of that great city no sooner found themselves quiet for a precarious moment than they demanded back the corrupting spectacles of their theatre, and lascivious talk was habitual, especially among the older men. These sins of Christians caused their Master's name to be blasphemed among the barbarians, who, though themselves without a faith, were more free from vice than their Christian foes. Must they not think that the apostles and prophets of the Lord were impure men, since the fruit of their exhortations is such as this? The same unfavourable comparison which is made between Christians and barbarians is drawn between Catholics and heretics. Goths and Vandals were both Arians, yet they displayed more charity towards one another than the Catholics, and the lash of Salvian's indignation falls upon the clergy themselves, who render no help to the oppressed, and, separating themselves in pretended penitence from their wives, give free rein to their avarice.

No doubt allowance must be made for the impetuous eloquence of Salvian, and for his monastic despair of the outer world; but when we remember how prone to sensual sins the inhabitants of the regions of which he speaks have shown themselves in quieter times, we shall perhaps be more ready to doubt whether his praise of heretic and barbarian be wholly deserved than to raise any question upon his denunciations of the falling Roman world. If his testimony is to be accepted, we must admire with the greater wonder the essential power of Catholic doctrine, and the devoted lives of the faithful few who carried it to victory under so great disadvantages.

While this was the condition of the Roman province, there was earnest work in the northern regions of Gaul among the fresh races in whom lay the expectations of the future.

Among the most celebrated efforts in this direction is the mission of SS. Germanus and Lupus to Britain. About the year A.D. 429 the clergy of Britain, hard pressed by the adherents of their countryman Pelagius, requested assistance from the Church of Gaul. A synod of Gallic bishops was convened to consider the appeal, and they gave of their best to the work when they consented to send Germanus and Lupus.

There is reason to believe that Pope Cœlestine co-operated in sending the two bishops on their mission. They produced immense effect, preaching the doctrines of grace in churches and by the highways, and overthrowing the Pelagians in public disputation. Great numbers of heathens were baptized,

and the Gallic mission impressed itself so deeply upon the memory of the British race that traces of it are found among the traditions of Wales.

The letters of S. Sidonius Apollinaris are a precious legacy to us from these awful times. He was a true product of classic influences. The heathen gods and goddesses play as important a figure in his poems as if they had been the real objects of his worship; yet he was a genuine Christian, capable of the greatest self-denial, and ready for work and for charity in the most overwhelming calamities.

He was partaker in the best of the worldly prizes which the times afforded, and in the classic civilisation which lingered in Gaul more than elsewhere.[1] He was son-in-law of Avitus, the Gallic nobleman whom a strange fortune elevated to the Empire, and overthrew within a few months. Sidonius accompanied his father-in-law to Rome, and delivered a panegyric upon him in the presence of the Senate on January 1, 456. The performance was rewarded by the erection of a bronze statue of the poet in the Forum of Trajan. On the death of Avitus, his son-in-law returned to Gaul, from whence he was recalled to the Imperial City to compose a new copy of verses in praise of a new emperor.

[1] "C'était dans la Lyonnaise, la Viennoise, la Narbonnaise, l'Acquitaine que l'ancienne civilisation sur son décline, s'était, pour ainsi dire, concentrée et conservait encore le plus de vie: l'Espagne et l'Italie même étaient à cette epoque beaucoup moins active que la Gaule, beaucoup moins riche en études et en écrivains. Peut-être faut-il attribuer surtout ce résultat au développement qu'avait pris dans ces provinces la civilisation grecque et à l'influence prolongée de sa philosophie dans toutes les grandes villes de la Gaule méridionale."—*Guizot, Civilisation en France*, Lec. vi.

M. Ampére quotes the expressions of reverence with which the poet approaches Rome, as one of the instances from various ages which illustrate the magic power of her name. The new panegyric was clever, but we have a proof of the dearth of capable men when we learn that it was rewarded by the appointment of the author to an important political place. He was made Prefect of Rome, an office to which the task of provisioning the city belonged. This responsibility alarmed the poet more than it pleased him, and on the expiration of his term of office he returned to Gaul, foreseeing, as may well be imagined, the close approach of another revolution in the Empire.

For some years after this exciting time, Sidonius led the life of a wealthy country gentleman of literary tastes and easy fortune. His friends were among the best people in Roman Gaul. Many of them were bishops, and many laymen of habits congenial to his own. The opulent leisure which seemed to Salvian so selfish looked different to those who enjoyed it; but Sidonius was interrupted by a general call from the people of Clermont to accept the bishopric of their town.

He made, as the custom was, a vehement resistance to this proposal. How far his repugnance was genuine we cannot decide. It cannot have been wholly feigned, for he treated the spiritual responsibilities of the office with seriousness and self-denial. They did not involve entire separation from secular cares. On the contrary, a Gallic bishop of the fifth century was a kind of representative of the people for all purposes. As

the connection with Rome became shadowy and the magistracies lost their efficiency, more and more of general power and responsibility fell to the bishop. In his election the people had taken an important part, and his place and dignity generally remained secure in the overthrow of all things secular which a barbarian conquest involved. The letters of Sidonius from this period afford ample proof of the variety of calls which his office brought on him. The saintly Lupus of Troyes welcomed the elevation of his friend in terms well fitted to call out all his Christian energy. "I thank God and our Lord Jesus Christ that the Holy Spirit, for the support of the Church, His well-loved spouse, in the midst of all the tribulations which assail her on every side, has called you, dear father, to the episcopate, to be a beacon in Israel and to execute the laborious offices, and learn the duties of the ministry, just as you have filled with such high reputation the shining dignities of secular life. Turn, then, all the talents you have displayed in the world towards the things of God, and let your words help your people to gather thorns from the head of the crucified Saviour, as they have helped them to gather roses from the bosom of worldly power."

Euric, the king of the Arian Visigoths, was now the nearest and most aggressive barbarian power. Many Catholic bishops were deposed, and some, it is said, actually put to death, in the departments which he seized. The Arvernians of Clermont made a determined resistance to his attempt upon their town. The bishop did his part in the siege with vigour; and when the

Visigoths retreated, leaving a desolated country behind them, he sold his own plate and gathered funds among all his friends to relieve the distress. His people, finding the Roman authorities ready to hand them over to the enemy, fell into great discouragement, and the help which the bishop devised for them was that of a mission. He invited from Lyons the presbyter Constantius, the most popular preacher of the day.[1] The effort had the desired effect upon them. But Auvergne was regarded by the rest of Roman Gaul as inevitably lost, and not only the imperial officers, but even the bishops of more fortunate districts, were willing to join in surrendering it to the Visigoths. Bitter were the reproaches which Sidonius addressed to his friend the Bishop Græcus for this cowardly surrender of a province which had suffered so much to maintain its union with the Empire. Failing all efforts to prevent the calamity, Sidonius endeavoured to procure the insertion in the treaty, of clauses securing the liberties of the Church. He seems to have failed even in this. Nevertheless, when others fled, he stood his ground, and was imprisoned by Euric for two years. We must not blame him if, after that time, he accepted the inevitable, and exercised his poetic gift in the praises of Euric, with the result that he secured his liberty and restoration to his see. His energy, however, was exhausted, and neither the work of his diocese nor the literary tasks which his friends suggested could dispel his apprehensions that the cause of Catholic truth was lost in Gaul; and he did not live long enough to see the

[1] Baret, *Sidoine Apollinaire*, p. 43 *et seq.*

rise and progress of the Franks, before whom the formidable power both of Burgundians and Visigoths was to bow.

The letters of Sidonius give a great deal of interesting information about the customs of the Gallic Church at the period when she was bidding farewell to Roman civilisation. Many churches displayed considerable splendour. Floor, walls, and windows were adorned with various marbles. The glass was of a greenish tinge, and the light fell upon many-coloured mosaic figures. The barbarian invasions naturally checked church work, and Sidonius congratulates a friend for building a new church at a time when others scarce dared to repair old ones. The best reward to the generous patron is a prayer for his conversion—that is, in the language of the time, his acceptance of orders, so that he might sacrifice for others, as he now erects an altar on which others should sacrifice for him.

Some graphic instances display the working of popular election as a method of choosing bishops. In one case the prelates of the province in which Chalons was situated assembled at that place for an episcopal election. There were three candidates. One of them was a man of birth, the second a man of lavish hospitality, and the third was known to be prepared to sacrifice the episcopal farms to reward his supporters. Among the assembled prelates there were two possessed of sufficient decision to set at nought the fear of the crowd, and consecrate to the office the worthy Archdeacon John, who had never thought of such an elevation. Once the thing was done, no one had a word

against it. The second instance occurred at Bourges, after Sidonius had himself become a bishop. Arriving at the town, he found that there was little prospect of a good appointment, "simple impudence" being the chief qualification of the candidates. He was dismayed to discover that, inexperienced as he was in such affairs, he was the only responsible person on the spot. He speaks even of the possibility of bribery. All, however, turned out well. The people left the choice to Sidonius, and he preached them a sermon which remains to show the difficulties in the choice of a bishop which existed at the time. Shall he nominate a monk? There will be complaints that he will be more an abbot than a bishop, fitter to intercede with God for the souls of his people than with earthly rulers for their bodies. Shall he choose a parish clergyman? His juniors in the ministry will be rivals, and his seniors will despise him, for men think that length of service is the only qualification, as if to have lived not well, but long, stood for all other graces. Shall he decide on a military man? The cry will be that Sidonius, having come from secular life to the episcopate, is puffed up with an admiration for rank, and despises Christ's poor. On the whole, he has resolved on the blessed Simplicius, hitherto a layman. He possesses the qualification of birth, which is not a despicable point: his ancestors have been bishops or prefects. Two other candidates may indeed be named who excel him in this respect, but both are disqualified by the canons as having entered into second marriages. Simplicius has a claim to gratitude for having built a church while he was

still a young military man with an increasing family. His wife also is well descended, and their two sons excellently brought up. And the sermon concludes, "As you have sworn that in respect of this election my judgment shall prevail; in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Simplicius is the man whom I nominate to be metropolitan of your province and bishop of your city. If you adopt my sentence, utter your assent, according to ancient custom."

It is well known that the penitential and deprecatory services called Litanies originated in this age with Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne. A letter from Sidonius to this prelate informs him that the unfortunate Arvernians, in prospect of the invasion of the Visigoths, are being instructed in this devotion, and place much trust in it for averting their threatened ruin. We learn from a letter to Faustus of Riez that the custom of applauding preachers in the church prevailed at this period, and the success of the mission of Constantius above described informs us how great was the power of the pulpit.

Sidonius, on attaining the episcopate, conformed to the canons by ceasing to regard his wife save as a sister. He declares that while she had been a good wife, she is the very best of sisters. Another letter shows us the ideal of the time on this point. It relates to a young man who, having wasted in dissolute living the largest part of his property, has married a virtuous maiden. Would that he had so far gained the victory that they could be induced to live apart. But as this is not to be expected, the bishop to whom Sidonius

writes is to pray that God would give them one or two sons—it would be almost too large a family—and then they might be induced to separate.

Sidonius displays no narrow spirit towards non-Christian faiths. His classical tastes would naturally make him lenient to the adherents of the old Roman religion. But he even displays towards the Jews a temper which compares most favourably with that of subsequent generations. Gozolas the Jew would be personally dear to him if his sect were not reprobate. A Jew is recommended to Eleutherius the bishop, with the hope that as these people generally have a good case in disputes about trade and temporal affairs, the bishop may be able to defend him.

Upon the system of devotion which prevailed in the ancient Church of Gaul, the reader must be referred to the well-known work of Mabillon.[1] It must suffice to say that the popular service at this period was the Eucharistic celebration on the Sundays and holidays, and that the form in which this sacred rite was offered partook more of the Greek character than of that which we find in the Roman mass. Much Scripture was read, not in continuous chapters, according to the fashion of the Church of England, but in selections carefully and very beautifully adapted to the festival or other observance to which the day was devoted. There were three portions of Scripture—first, an excerpt from the Old Testament; secondly, the Epistle; and thirdly, the Gospel, upon which followed a homily. And so much value was attached to this element of the service,

[1] *De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ*, Paris, 1729.

that we find S. Cæsarius of Arles reproving those who left the church after the reading of Scripture; a little attention should show them that the mass is not completed when the Bible has been read, but when the gifts have been offered and the consecration effected. They can read Scripture lessons at home, but nowhere hear or see the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord except in the House of God. But about this point of the service the catechumens and the unworthy are directed to leave the church. The Proper Preface in the Gallican rite was termed the Contestatio or Immolatio—in the Mosarabic or Spanish form, Illatio. Wonderful care and variety of adaptation to the occasion is displayed in this as well as in the other variable portions of the service, and we are impressed with a certainty that the form was the careful and studied production of divines well skilled in Scripture and in the science of devotion.

The consecration was followed by a collect called "After the mystery," which contains in some cases an invocation of the Spirit upon the sacrament, a feature which was undoubtedly derived from the East, where it forms an invariable and essential part of the consecration. The Lord's Prayer after the consecration was said or shouted by the people as well as the priest. This constituted the participation of the people in the service, and was perhaps as much as the state of education enabled them to contribute. The extreme variation, according to the seasons, which marked most of the other portions of the liturgy, beautiful and instructive as it is to read, must have been impossible

for a congregation to take part in. They could not have found out the places even if they could have possessed the books.

The want of a Gallic antiphonary is in some degree supplied by that of the monastery of Bangor in Ireland,[1] discovered at Bobio in Italy, where it had been left by S. Columbanus or some of his followers. The Gallic connections of this Irish book are marked by a very long hymn "upon Christ," which is attributed to S. Hilary. In it occur some Greek words, a feature not uncommon in prayers used in Ireland, and pointing to that connection of Ireland with Gaul and Gaul with Greece to which we have before alluded.

So much for the services in which the faithful at large took part. The daily services of the Gallic Church could not be so described. In very early times the daily services were three—one for night, one for early morning, and one for the evening; the two former making in practice but one. Private forms were also recommended, and it is probable that the first use of the canonical hours arose in the fifth century from the latter source. There is considerable reason to think that Cassian had a leading part in arranging, not alone the offices for the hours which obtained the sanction of his friend S. Leo, and formed the foundation of the present Roman Breviary, but also a series of offices for his own Gallic monastery, from which came the Cursus Gallicus, and which S. Augustine of Canterbury afterwards introduced into England.

The latest of the great churchmen of Roman Gaul

[1] Lately published in facsimile by the Henry Bradshaw Society.

were S. Avitus of Vienne and S. Cæsarius of Arles, and from their lives and letters we obtain important information as to the state of the Church when the great transition to barbarian rule finally took effect. S. Avitus enjoyed the favour both of Gundobald, the Burgundian king, Arian though he was, and of Clovis, the Frank, even before his conversion. An important conference took place between Catholic and Arian prelates in the presence of King Gundobald, in which Avitus was the chief speaker. It seems plain that the monarch regarded the assaults of Clovis the Frank upon his dominions as the strongest argument against Catholicity. "If your faith be true," said he, "why do you not hinder King Clovis from attacking my borders and leaguing with my enemies? He who covets other people's goods has not the true faith." This king never made up his mind to the Catholic faith, but his heir, and a large proportion of his subjects, accepted the orthodox creed.

S. Cæsarius of Arles was a younger contemporary of S. Avitus. He was marked by a clear vocation to the work of God from very early years, and was admitted to minor orders at the age of eighteen. Two years afterwards he retired to Lerins. But his health suffered from the austerities to which he subjected himself, and the abbot sent him to Arles for recovery. The bishop of that place discerned his high endowments, and begged the monastery to surrender him for the ministry. And when the good prelate felt his end approaching, he recommended Cæsarius to the clergy and people as a successor well fitted to restore the

relaxed discipline of the diocese. Cæsarius' first care as bishop was to revive the public use of the daily services in his church of S. Stephen. The offices of terce, sext, and none were to be said every day with hymns, and prime was to be added on Sundays and festivals. These services were expected to be but poorly attended by the faithful at large, for the biographer of the saint tells us that they were established so "that if perchance any of the laity or of the penitents desired to join in the sacred services, he might be able without excuse to attend the daily office." Cæsarius was extremely diligent in preaching, and when he was prevented from performing this duty in person, he was wont to commit to some presbyter, or even deacon, the charge of reading a sermon to the people, either his own or one of S. Ambrose or S. Augustine. Far from being supposed to humiliate the lower clergy by this command, S. Cæsarius was censured for intrusting to them in any form a duty usually restricted to bishops. We gather from one of the homilies of S. Cæsarius some idea of the standard of Christian duty which it was found possible to set before the Gallic laity at this period. A Christian man should be peaceful and a peacemaker, truthful, and careful to live so that his children shall be guided by his example to heaven, not to hell. He is to show the same care for children for whom he has stood sponsor as for his own. He is to bring his own oblations to the altar to be consecrated; a man who is able to bring his own should be ashamed to communicate by means of the offerings of others. He must avoid drunkenness and excess in eating, and

he must not press others to either of these sins, lest he destroy both their souls and his own. He must come to church on Sundays, lest he be put to shame by the unhappy Jews, who do no work whatever on their Sabbath. In church he must not talk, but pray for pardon of his sins, and listen attentively to the lessons from Holy Scripture. He must pay to the churches the tithe of all his increase, and he must sedulously avoid such pagan practices as keeping Thursday holy in honour of Jupiter, an observance practised by some who care little to rest on Sundays in honour of Christ. In a sermon for Lent S. Cæsarius enjoins the faithful to attend the vigils, and the services of terce, sext, and none during the day, unless hindered by some special cause; and the preacher begs them to spare some hours every day for Lenten reading, in addition to their devotions in church.

S. Cæsarius had nothing more deeply at heart than the organisation of community life both for men and women. His first attempt at erecting a convent for nuns was ruined in the siege of Arles by the Franks. Upon this occasion the besiegers were repelled, and the very churches were filled with the prisoners whom the Visigoths captured. Cæsarius dispensed the whole treasure of the Church, sold the sacred vessels, and scraped the precious metals from the columns of the building to supply the poor captives with food and covering. In the peace the good Archbishop resumed and completed the convent with a great church, the nave of which was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and the aisles to S. John and S. Martin. Cæsaria, his

sister, who had been trained to conventual life in one of Cassian's establishments, was abbess. The Archbishop himself drew up the rule, which was only imposed after repeated practical test and alteration. A novitiate of a year was to try the reality of a supposed vocation. The sister, when received, was never to leave the convent or the adjoining church until her death. The superior was to prescribe the work which should employ her, but all were to learn to read and write, and two hours each day were to be employed in study. The dress was to be very simple, and made in the house itself.

Cæsarius held a commission from Rome to convene councils throughout Gaul and Spain. The first which he assembled was at Agde in the year 506. It deprived of ecclesiastical functions those priests or deacons who refused to separate from their wives. It restricted the admission of nuns to those above forty years old, and forbade the foundation of new convents without permission of the bishop. It ordained that lay people who did not communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide should not be regarded as Catholics. The second Synod of Orange, held by Cæsarius in A.D. 529, concerned itself with matter still more important, for it brought to an end the semi-Pelagian movement, and recognised the Augustinian doctrines of grace as the accredited belief of the Gallic Church. The synod was a very small one, which perhaps is the reason why its canons are framed with such care and moderation. The character of the canons is that they confine themselves to the practical aspects of the life of grace, and

that many theoretical questions which have perplexed mankind in this insoluble controversy are wholly passed by. Nothing is said of predestination, nothing of election; and it does not seem possible for any one to refuse the canons of Orange, unless he claims some good in man uncaused by grace. The definitions are drawn from S. Augustine. S. Cæsarius had so great a love for the memory of that saint that his desire was to die at some time near the death-day of the African saint; and upon the eve of the feast of S. Augustine in the year 542 he departed. The cities of Arles and Marseilles, the last remnants of the Roman dominion in Gaul, had passed a few years before by voluntary cession from the Ostrogoths of Italy to the Franks.

It is not certain that without the destruction of the Visigothic power, Gaul would have seen the establishment of an Arian monarchy; for in Spain the same race turned Catholic, while in Gaul itself the Burgundians became orthodox and retained their settlements. But at all events, the faith of the Church was supreme when the power of Rome disappeared from the country which we may now call France. It was divided into three portions: the first, Aquitaine, which, though laid open to the Franks by their victories, was sparsely occupied by them, and had for the bulk of its population the Gallo-Romans; the second, Burgundy; and the third the country north of the Loire, where the Franks chiefly dwelt, Neustrians to the west, and Austrasians to the east. Nowhere were the ancient races destroyed. The Roman laws and magistracies remained. But the clergy, and above all the bishops, alone in the body

politic possessed an assured position linked to the recollections and institutions of the past, and secure of the respect of the new races.

That the Franks were content with the character of fellow-members in the community with the existing population[1] was due in no small degree to the Church which had made them Catholics. But it was not to be expected that their untrained and forceful nature would fail to assert itself; and from whom could the Gallo-Romans expect assistance against the encroachments of their half-civilised fellow-citizens so well as from the bishops? The bishops became the municipal authorities, the true tribunes of the people. The election of bishops had presented under the Empire the best existing instance of popular choice, kept in restraint by sufficient external authority. It had attracted the attention of the good Emperor Alexander Severus as an excellent model; and now, when the official municipalities lost their weight as protectors of the people, the episcopate stepped forward to supply their place. Even when the popular vote ceased to form the method of episcopal appointment, the sacred relations of the office preserved its character as the friend and advocate of the people; and while the methods in which this character was exercised might be purely moral and religious at the first, they entered gradually more into the established constitution of the State side by side with those of the king and the noble.

[1] At the opening of the Revolution the Abbé Sieyes wrote a famous pamphlet called *Qu'est que le Tiers Etat?* It was, according to him, the descendants of the Romans and Gauls, while the nobles came from the Frankish conquerors. See Aug. Thierry, *Sur l'Histoire de France*, vol. iii.

The recognised machinery of episcopal legislation was the council; and from the beginning of Frankish dominion, when the first Council of Orleans was called by Clovis, after the defeat of the Visigoths, the council assumed the character of a political as well as a religious assembly. The kings, the Frankish nobles, and the Gallo-Roman officials repaired thither along with the prelates; but when they assembled, it was the bishops who led and ruled the debates. They possessed the best education, the highest influence, and the most definite conception of their own objects.

The intellectual superiority of the clergy was maintained by the episcopal schools. Every diocese had its own, and the greatest names among the bishops of the sixth and seventh centuries are known to us either as brought up in them, or as presiding over them. Each seminary possessed its arch-presbyter and primicerius, and taught the seven sciences which completed the recognised course of study, namely, grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, geometry, astrology, arithmetic, and music.

In the sixth century primary schools were established, and Cæsarius of Arles noticed the existence of such institutions in Italy, and returned to his native Gaul full of the desire to introduce them; and the second Council of Vaison decreed the establishment of parish schools in all the dioceses of the province of Arles. Every priest in charge of a parish was thenceforth bound to assemble the young children of his cure and teach them reading, music, and virtuous behaviour. Such humble institutions leave little record in history; but the probability is that they spread in France, and

thus it came to pass that when the classical education of the country went to ruin, the ecclesiastical took its place. Whatever the comparative merits of the training might be, the tendency of such a system to increase the influence of the clergy is self-evident.

The enmity which in later ages arose between the monastic bodies and the secular clergy did not at this time exist. The monks were chiefly laity. But we have seen that the most distinguished of them were wont to pass into the ranks of the secular clergy, or into the episcopate. The monastic schools therefore helped to assist the growth of clerical influence; while, on the other hand, the influence of the clergy was a potent cause of the vast development which the monastic institutions attained during the Merovingian era. There was no such thing in this period as earnestness or holiness or truthfulness, which stood distinct from the various offices and ways of life which the Church had framed and approved. The overwhelming power which goodness and knowledge possess even in barbarous times was all on the side of the clergy. Each monastery had its library, and copying books was a principal occupation of the better instructed of the inmates. S. Cæsaria at Arles taught even her nuns to copy the Scriptures in fair writing.

It was the custom of the nobles of the German tribes to intrust their children to the care of the king. They were brought up in his court and devoted to his service. As long as the nation remained heathen, they learned no lessons save those of war and the chase. But as the fierce manners of the race were softened by inter-

course with civilisation, the kings sought for learning themselves, and thought it their duty to impart to the boys intrusted to their care some better education than that of barbarians. They were obliged to seek teachers for the schools of the palace in the monasteries or among the clergy. A certain proportion of the youthful pupils preferred to adopt the sacerdotal or monastic life which they respected in their tutors; and although the influx of clergy of barbarian descent was regarded with dismay by S. Gregory the Great, yet this too became an undoubted source of increase to the importance of the clerical order, which drew into it the best spirits of the new race as well as of the old.

The age succeeding the barbarian conquest of Gaul was not one of intellectual indolence. The remains of its literature which exist, though they be, at M. Guizot's estimate, not the hundredth part of what it originally produced, yet suffice to show that it was a time of fertility. It is true that the beauty of classic form departs from it more and more. Poets such as S. Avitus find that they can no longer secure readers. The chief historian of the period, Gregory of Tours, laments the vanishing of classic art, and he has himself lost the old dignity of style and art of arrangement. But we console ourselves for the absence of these merits when we observe how faithfully his pages reflect the turbulent period to which they refer, and with what graphic power he places his personages on the scene; and if he be prodigal in the miraculous, we must allow for the anticipation of his age that miracles ought to occur.

In the first century of barbarian rule the bishops were of Gallo-Roman blood; but in the succeeding age the Frankish kings learnt to invade the privileges of the Christian laity, and to raise their own favourites to these posts of influence. With this change the intellectual character of the episcopate declined, carrying down with it the general standard, and we prepare for the Dark Ages.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE BARBARIANS.

Increase of the power of the clergy—Intellectual declension in the seventh century—Gallic Councils of the period—Relations to Rome—S. Gregory of Tours—S. Gregory the Great—Monasticism—The Benedictine mission—S. Columbanus—Secularisation of the episcopate.

CLOVIS after baptism became a convinced and unwavering Catholic in faith, though his passionate nature was never tamed. S. Remy was the agent in the conversion of the Franks,[1] and it was by his prompting that S. Avitus of Vienne was set upon the work which effected at last the accession of the Burgundians to the Catholic creed. In the Burgundian dominions we find the first combination of the bishops of the Church to support each other in resisting royal coercion. A certain Stephen, who held an important office under King Sigismund, had contracted marriage within the prohibited degrees, and was excommunicated by the bishops solemnly assembled at Lyons. The king took part with his minister, and threatened the bishops with his anger if the sentence were not removed. At a second assembly it was deliberately confirmed, and, in the apprehension of further aggression, the bishops resolved that if one bishop were persecuted the others

[1] Michelet, Hist. of France, Eng. trans. by Smith, i. 31.

should defend him ; that if the king opposed the united episcopate, the prelates should one and all retire into their monasteries till peace should be restored; and that during their retirement any who should perform ecclesiastical functions or ordinations in their dioceses should be deposed and excommunicated, along with those who, in pursuance of such an ordination, should take possession of churches. After a period of anger and persecution the king fell sick, and on his restoration to health by the prayers of the Bishop of Valence, he was reconciled to the Church.

It was probably after this restoration of friendship that Avitus of Vienne and Viventiolus of Lyons convoked a council of the bishops of Burgundy at Epaon. Avitus in his letter of summons intimates that the Pope had reproached him for the small number of councils held among them, and presses them to assemble; should severe illness hinder any one, he must choose two of his worthiest presbyters to act for him. The laity were invited to assist, and were informed that the council was ready to hear any accusation they might have against their clergy, provided it were not inspired by malice, and that it were duly proved. Twenty-five bishops came together. The canons adopted prescribed to bishops the obligation to attend councils and ordinations when summoned by the metropolitan, and forbade them to ordain as deacon or priest those who had been twice married, or to admit into any clerical order those who had been put to public penance.

Neither bishops, priests, or deacons are to breed

dogs or falcons for the chase, under penalty of three, two, or one month's excommunication for the three orders respectively. A priest must not officiate in another diocese, and must not even travel without the permission of his diocesan, whose letter of commendation must be his passport to the communion of any Church. The discipline—that is to say, corporal punishment—is to be used in the correction of the minor clergy. It was already used in monasteries.

In one of the canons of this council the period of penance for heresy after baptism is abridged to two years, during which the penitent will fast twice in the week, and leave the church at the same time with the catechumens.

The national council for the kingdoms of the Visigoths was held at Agde in the year 506. Its canons impose the strictest continence on bishops and priests. A well-known direction ordains that any clerk who allows his hair to grow is to be forcibly cropped by the archdeacon. We must presume a tendency on the part of some Gallo-Romans to adopt the habits of the conquering barbarians, while the bishops considered it inexpedient that the clergy should be divided by different fashions.

The sermons of S Cæsarius inform us that in his time many heathen customs still subsisted. The adoration of trees and fountains, the taking of auguries, prophecy by the song of birds, lucky days for setting out on a journey or for returning. The Lord, says the saint, has made all days, and they are all good. When, therefore, you have to go a journey, make the

sign of the cross, say the Lord's Prayer or the creed, and trouble not yourselves about auguries. Especially on S. John the Baptist's day the faithful must not go to fountains, lakes, or rivers, to lave themselves in the night or in the morning. No idle songs are to profane the lips which receive the blessed Eucharist. But some of these superstitions have been but imperfectly uprooted at this very day.

The first Council of Orleans convoked by Clovis partook, as before noted, of the character of a parliament as well as an assembly of the Church. Its canons have in many instances the nature of a concordat between Church and State, and the precedent thus set was followed in succeeding history, the more so because it arose naturally out of the position which the clergy held in the land. The churches and the houses of the bishops are constituted places of refuge, from whence even criminals could not be torn, and the bishop is forbidden to remove them without an oath from their pursuers that no violence shall be done to them. The bishop who ordains a slave must pay to his master double his value, for ordination sets him free. Nor may any layman be received into the ranks of the clergy without the permission of the king or the judge. Only the children and descendants of the clergy themselves are at the disposal of the bishop to ordain them if he will. Abbots, priests, and other clerks are forbidden without the bishop's leave to repair to the court in order to solicit favours.

When the bishops in council had completed their decrees, they presented them to the king with this

letter: "To King Clovis, the glorious son of the Catholic Church, all the bishops assembled in council by his order. It is by the inspiration of thy ardent zeal for the good of religion and the faith that thou hast united us in council to treat together as becomes bishops, of many important questions. It is just that we should address to thee our answers to the questions thou hast proposed to us. If thou judge them worthy of thy approbation, the authority of so great a king joined to that of so many bishops will assure their exact observance."

The frightful series of murders by which the heirs of Clovis surpassed their father show that the Church had not reclaimed the barbarian race in a generation. Clotilda herself, whose name is among the saints, preferred to see her little orphan children put to death by their uncle than degraded from their kingly estate by the clipping of their hair.

But we learn by a letter from S. Remy the influence which the royal power, even so imperfectly represented, was already acquiring. He is answering an accusation of violating the canons in the ordination of a priest. "Know that I was not corrupted by a bribe to raise Claudius to the priesthood. I did it at the request of the great king who was the preacher and defender of the Catholic faith. You say that what he asked of me was not conformable to the canons. What right have you to raise this question? Are you invested with the supreme pontificate? Your hate has blinded you, and you forget without doubt that it is the same king who caused you to be raised to the episcopate." Thus early do we see the intervention of the royal power, though

wielded by so imperfect a Christian as Clovis, exercising authority in affairs of the Church.

A resolute attempt was made by the more earnest bishops of the time to sustain the standard of clerical education. In the school of Arles it was required that a candidate for orders should have read the Bible four times over.

As a specimen of the religious life which the age admired in women, the history of Ste. Radegondis will serve. She was the daughter of a king of Thuringia, who was defeated by the sons of Clovis, and the girl, at the age of eight, with her brother, was carried to Soissons. Her delight was to serve the Church and read the lives of the saints. But Clotaire resolved to marry her; for a plurality of wives was among the relaxations of the law of Christianity which the Frankish kings demanded. The murder of her brother by order of her husband caused her to fly his house, and she took sanctuary with S. Médard of Noyau, of whom she demanded consecration as a nun. The bishop hesitated, not from a sense of her duty as a wife, for she cannot have been a wife in the sight of the Church, but from fear of the king. She persisted, however, and was received, distributing on the spot her regal ornaments to the poor. Clotaire yielded to her wishes, and helped to build her a monastery near Poitiers, where she devoted herself to extraordinary austerities. During the first Lent of her ascetic life she partook of bread only on Thursdays and Sundays, and lived for the rest upon roots and herbs, lay upon ashes, and clothed herself in garments of hair. She wore a chain

for the whole of Lent, which she drew so tightly that it sank into the flesh, and she heated a metal cross in the fire, which she applied to her body.

Frequent councils of the bishops became a necessity of the time. It was only the sense of union and mutual helpfulness, maintained with constant care and energy among the members of the Church, that could prevent her from sinking to the moral level of the surrounding society; and the defence of the Gallo-Roman population, falling ever into deeper depression, required frequent consultation among the bishops, their only protectors. The provisions of the Salic law show with arithmetical distinctness the comparative estimate which the ruling race formed of the conquered ; for they impose penalties for injuries to Franks or barbarians exactly double those demanded for similar offences against Gallo-Romans.

The very first means which the councils deem necessary for maintaining the distinctness of Church life is the celibacy and the purity of the clergy. All the orders down to subdeacons are included in the rule of continence. They are likewise forbidden to lend on usury or engage in trade; and that the strict rules of clerical life may not be undertaken without due consideration, the age for ordination as priest is fixed at thirty years, that for deacon at twenty-five.

Parish priests begin to obtain security and independence. The charge of a parish with the enjoyment of its revenue may be committed by the bishop for a limited time or in permanence. In the latter case the charge cannot be taken away by the successor of the bishop who has conferred it. But it was not on the

part of the bishop alone that the poor parish priest had reason to fear an assault on his slender income. The secular powers were ever in want of money. Clotaire, king of Soissons, issued an edict that all the churches of his dominions should give him the third of their property. The bishops of the realm were assembled and forced to sign the decree—all but S. Injuriosus of Tours, who denounced the king in full council. If he spoiled the possessions of God, God would spoil him of his kingdom: it was a crying injustice that he should fill his barns with the goods of the poor, whom he ought rather to feed with his own. The bishop quitted the assembly without saluting the king. But Clotaire was afraid to bring on himself the wrath of S. Martin, who spoke through his successor. Rich presents, together with the reversal of the extortionate demand, were required to give emphasis to the king's request for forgiveness. But so large a share in Church affairs fell to the Frankish princes, that we cannot wonder if they often failed to recognise the distinction between the temporalities of Church and of State, and claimed not only a share of Church property, but also power to erect bishoprics and assign them dioceses without regard to the rights of existing sees. The bishops, however, held their ground by working upon the fears of their untutored patrons.

To the bishop alone in his diocese belonged at this time the power of excommunication; no other bishop could pretend to remove it without incurring the same sentence. If the excommunication was manifestly unjust, the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops could

suspend its execution until the assembly of the next council, by which the question should be decided. The power of the bishop was so great that it might easily have become despotic, had it not been subject to the judgment of his peers; but he was under his metropolitan, who himself was under the authority of his comprovincials. These it was his duty to call together once or twice a year, on pain of a year's suspension. The bishops incurred the same penalty for non-attendance without legitimate excuse; and as the Frankish princes in their frequent wars pretended to the power of forbidding their bishops to attend councils in other kingdoms, it was expressly laid down that such a prohibition constituted no valid excuse for absence.

Thus the government of the Church by the bishops acting individually and in community was more real than it is among ourselves. The Pope was at the head of the system, but recourse was had to him only when necessity obliged. We shall see in much later times how the Popes encouraged reference to them in the first instance. But now a bishop who considered himself aggrieved by his metropolitan and comprovincials might appeal to Rome. The Pope exercised a certain interference among the Gallic Churches through a vicar, who, before the Frankish conquest, was ordinarily the Bishop of Arles. In the first period of barbarian rule, when Gaul was divided into three kingdoms, there were three vicars—S. Remy, S. Avitus, and the Bishop of Arles, for the Franks, Burgundians and Visigoths respectively. But when the Franks had reduced the whole country to subjection the Bishop of Arles resumed

his general functions; yet the pallium by which this authority was conveyed could not be given without the authority of the Emperor at Constantinople, who still represented the ancient majesty of Rome. So clearly do we discern the connection between the authority exercised by the Pope and the ineffaceable majesty attached to imperial Rome.

The ancient system of election to the episcopate was greatly disturbed by the power of the Frankish kings, who used, to the increase of their own influence, the voice in these appointments which had been conferred by the Council of Orleans. The larger the power of the king, the less creditable were the selections. Gallo-Romans of submissive character and Frankish favourites of the Crown, filled the vacant sees. The king even pretended to erect new sees; and thus we find the Bishop of Chartres making solemn complaint at the fourth Council of Paris that a certain Promotus has been consecrated bishop of a district withdrawn from the diocese of Chartres. Another Council of Paris decreed that whoever usurped the episcopal dignity by the authority of the king must not be recognised by the comprovincials on pain of excommunication. But the evil prevailed, with its natural consequence of degradation to the Church.

Nevertheless, the care for correctness of doctrine remained, and great anxiety was caused among the Gallic bishops by reports disadvantageous to the orthodoxy of Pelagius, successor to the unfortunate Pope Vigilius. A demand of satisfaction was made to Pelagius by King Childebert, and the pontiff did not disdain

to clear himself by repeated assurances of his acceptance of the letter of Pope Leo to the Council of Chalcedon. This did not prove sufficient to allay the murmurs, and a detailed account of the Pope's belief upon all the points in controversy at the period was submitted, on the ground that S. Peter bids us be ready to give to all that ask a reason of the hope that is in us. But the pride of Rome was humbled at this period by the miseries which overwhelmed Italy, and the Pope prays the Frankish king and his officers to have pity upon the poor Italians who sought a refuge in Gaul.

The monastic institutions continued to progress, and among all the events which marked the sixth century, none was more important for the religious life in France than the first appearance of Benedictine monks. Innocent, the Bishop of Le Mans, sent his archdeacon and his steward to Monte Cassino to solicit a colony of the children of S. Benedict for a monastery which he designed to establish. The leader of the momentous expedition was S. Maurus. Four monks, Simplicius, Antonius, Constantianus, and Faustus, were to regard him as their abbot, and S. Benedict himself committed to them on their departure a copy of the rule of the order written with his own hands. They journeyed through Switzerland and France subsisting on the hospitality of the religious houses on the way. But on their arrival at Orleans they learned that the holy bishop who had invited them was dead. His successor refused to renew the invitation. But Harderar, the steward, had a relative named Florus at the court of Theodebert, who was already anxious to found a

monastery, and assigned to the new monks a property termed Glanfeuil, where the first Benedictine monastery in France was founded. Maurus organised the work, and retired to a solitary cell, where he died. Two of the Italians returned to Monte Cassino, but the French foundation flourished under Florianus, the son of Harderar. We find this noble enterprise, so full of promise for the future, more interesting by far than the attempt of S. Oulfroi to live on a pillar after the example of Oriental ascetics. Though the saint represents the interference of the neighbouring bishops with his horrible life as an instance how Satan hinders the work of the Lord, yet we may suspect that he recognised their argument that the climate did not permit such self-torment. He descended to live with his brethren, and the bishop during his absence caused his pillar to be demolished.

We are glad to surrender to the secular historian the frightful history of crime which is associated with the names of Fredegonda and Brunehild. But affairs in Church and State were closely united. Bishops are nowhere absent from the most secular events, nor kings from ecclesiastical. King Chilperic I., who possessed many merits, considering the times, thought himself a theologian, as many royal personages have done, and conceived the idea that the application of the term "person" to the Divine Being was an insult to the only appropriate term, namely, God. He composed a treatise to this effect, which was read in his presence to Gregory of Tours and enforced by a declaration of the royal pleasure, "I will that you believe

thus, you and the other doctors of the Church." "Excellent king," replied the bishop, "it will be for you to follow the doctrine which we have taught you after the apostles and doctors of the Church, especially Hilary and Eusebius."

Gregory relates to us also an interesting discussion which he held with a Jew in the presence of the same prince. The arguments were those which the Church has ever used, and turned largely upon the prophecies of the Bible, with which Gregory shows himself well acquainted. Arians also felt the brunt of his reasonings, and if the good bishop was really as triumphant as he supposes himself to have been, he was an effective defender of the faith. We find among the discussions which he records such strange heresies as that of a priest who had imbibed Sadducean notions respecting the resurrection of the body, while more than one religious fanatic attracted multitudes of simple people by extravagant claims of inspiration.

Gregory terminates the story of his controversial encounters with the words: "Enough of these people: let us turn to the Monastery of Sainte Croix, where the pious Radegondis ended her life." This devoted woman left behind her the most solemn injunctions to the bishops to sustain her foundation on the basis on which she had placed it,[1] but her pious wishes were not respected; for a certain ambitious nun named Clotilda, presuming upon her royal birth, raised a rebellion against the duly chosen abbess, and withdrew no less than forty nuns, who devoted themselves to her cause.

[1] Aug. Thierry, *Temps Merovingiens*, Recit. v.

They undertook a journey to the court of King Gunthram for the purpose of lodging their complaint. The king promised to have the matter sifted by bishops, but sent none, and Clotilda called to her aid a number of criminals, who dispersed with blows a meeting of prelates called by the Bishop of Bordeaux. After a long series of outrages, sufficient to prove the disordered ecclesiastical condition of the time, it does not seem that this insubordinate nun received much punishment. Her excommunication was removed at the intercession of King Childebert, and she retired to a house given her by the king, while her companions returned to the monastery.

The discipline of bishops is illustrated by the punishment meted to three prelates by the Council of Mâcon. They were condemned to support for a year a bishop whom they had consecrated upon the nomination of a usurper. For taking part in a treasonable conspiracy, Uricinus of Cahors was put to penance for three years, during which time he was forbidden to trim his hair or beard, to eat meat or drink wine, to celebrate Mass or ordain clergy, to consecrate the chrism or give the blessing. The temporal administration of his diocese was to remain to him.

The bishops who surrounded Gunthram in the councils of Burgundy were better informed than their contemporaries of Neustria and Austrasia. The Gallo-Roman spirit still lingered in Burgundy, and the school of the palace educated a large number of remarkable men; but even the Burgundian canons display influences at work in the Church similar to those of the

ruder provinces. The second Council of Mâcon shows anxiety to preserve the clergy from sensual temptations, and a jealous sense of the extreme difficulty of effecting this object. A curious ordinance marks the social position which the clergy asserted. Laymen are commanded to make a profound salutation to the higher clergy when they meet, and a layman on horseback is to dismount in order to make his obeisance to a clerk who is walking.

The Councils of Burgundy command the observance of the practice, which had fallen into some disuse, of baptizing at Easter, except in case of necessity. The faithful are to communicate fasting. The rule extended even to children, to whom it was usual to distribute, on Wednesdays and Fridays, the fragments of the offerings which remained. Women are not to receive the blessed Sacrament in the open hand, as men do, but in a napkin, which they must bring for the purpose. They must be veiled at Communion; if the veil have been forgotten, they must defer their participation.

The case of the poor and afflicted is urgently pressed upon the bishops, who are the Church's almoners. They are obliged to clothe and feed all lepers, and the episcopal abode must be open at all times to receive the afflicted.

Certain strange relics of heathenism are condemned, as putting on the skins of animals on the 1st of January. Stringent laws are established with regard to Jews. They are prohibited from holding any judicial position over Christians, and from collecting taxes. They are confined to their houses from Maunday Thursday to Easter Day. They are not to sit down without permission in presence of a bishop. Christians

must not eat with them, and they are bound to release Christian slaves for a nominal ransom.

At the second Council of Mâcon King Gunthram pronounced a discourse which shows that the assembly was invested with a parliamentary character, and aided the monarch to rule his people. "We will that these articles which we publish be observed, since we have propounded them in the sacred Council of Mâcon." The ecclesiastical authority was more effective than the civil, and we find the council confirming donations and bequests made by the King and his family for Church purposes.

The seventh century opens in the pontificate of Gregory the Great. This illustrious Pope took special pains to reform the abuses which had diffused themselves widely in the Church of Gaul. He writes to Virgilius, Bishop of Arles, that he has learnt that no one in Germany or in Gaul arrives at the episcopate without having paid for it, that laymen receive the tonsure and the episcopate at the same time, and that holy orders are purchased.

Queen Brunehilde having solicited from the Pope the pallium for Syagrius, Bishop of Autun, S. Gregory took occasion to write an admirable letter of admonition upon the necessity of Church reform. The Pope has learnt that simony prevails in Gaul, and counts it impossible to preserve that love and charity with which the Church should be united in her Master until we rid ourselves of cupidity, the root of all evil. "Dear brethren," he proceeds, "work with all your power to restore your ordinations to their true idea, that your

candidates be really elect, and that in appointments no regard be had to money, lest your bishops appear to have obtained their places by auction rather than by the judgment of God." Provincial councils appear to the Pope the most important means of restoring discipline. The canons direct that they shall be summoned twice a year; but, if this be impossible, let them assemble at least once a year.

Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, was likewise desirous of the pallium, and the Pope was about to grant it to him when the news reached him that Desiderius was used to give public lectures on grammar in his episcopal city. This intelligence changed all his joy into sadness; "for," says the Pope, "the same mouth cannot chant the praises of Jupiter and of Jesus Christ, and it is a shameful thing that a bishop should speak of things which would be unbecoming even for a religious layman. Desiderius, therefore, shall not have the pallium except on condition of clearing himself of this charge." It is not known whether he did so, but subsequent letters show the best understanding between Pope and bishop. The strong prejudice which S. Gregory displays against literature shows that we have left behind the period when classical culture was thought desirable in a churchman, and the heathen divinities passed easily into his talk without any suspicion that he believed in them. We should have thought that, if Desiderius was making attempts to preserve culture from the utter ruin which was so fast overwhelming it, he was doing a good deed.

The mission of Augustine had, as we all know, an

astonishing success in Britain, and on two occasions reinforcements were sent to it from Rome. All these mission parties passed through Gaul, and Syagrius of Autun and Œtherius of Lyons were conspicuous for their kindness to the Italians. Augustine made inquiry at Rome how he should comport himself towards the bishops of Gaul. S. Gregory replied that he must in no wise interfere with the commission of the Bishop of Arles to act as Papal legate, but if he sees anything amiss, is to confide his observations to that prelate. Augustine represented the encroaching spirit of Rome more truly than the Pope himself when he asked how it came that, when the faith is one, customs should be different, and the forms of the Mass in Gaul should wander so far from that of Rome. The larger-minded Gregory replies that whatever the missionary finds in Gaul or elsewhere which appears to him more pleasing to God than the Roman form, he is to adopt it for the uses of his infant Church.

A correspondence between the same Pope and the Bishop of Marseilles informs us that the latter, perceiving a tendency among his people to adore the images which stood in the church, had destroyed them. The Pope replies that he was quite right in his fears of idolatry, but ought not to have destroyed the images, which the Church retains for the purpose of instructing those who cannot read. He should have kept the images, and instructed the people not to adore them.

While S. Gregory was at work in attempting to correct the faults of the secular clergy of Gaul, another great reformer from a foreign land was giving his life

to the elevation of its monastic ideal. The Irish Columbanus at the end of the sixth century appeared in Gaul, and settled, by the invitation of King Guntram, at Anegrai, in the Vosges. The numbers of his society multiplied so largely that he was presently obliged to seek a site for a second monastery, and found it at Luxeuil. The rule was severe. The monks took no food until the evening; no meat was ever used. A monk must not only possess nothing, but not even desire it; absolute surrender of property was but the first step of monastic perfection. The repetition of the Psalms was according to the use of Bangor, Columbanus's old home in Ireland; and to his rule of vocal prayer he adds the admonition that it will all be useless unless to the vocal prayer be added the prayer of the heart and a continual union with God. To the rule is appended the Penitential, in which the ordinary penance consists of blows with a stick. Six strokes were the penalty for omitting an Amen at prayers, for talking at meals, for smiling during the office, or for neglect of careful toilet before saying or serving Mass. The monks slept in their habit, but they had one suit for the night and one for the day. They were to be very careful about cleanliness, and it was part of penance not to be allowed to wash the head except on Sundays.

The Church of Ireland had a peculiar usage in the celebration of Easter. The Irish (not to mention a difference in computing the relations of the lunar to the solar year) kept the festival on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the lunar month when it fell on Sunday, and not on the Sunday after the fifteenth as the general

usage prescribed.[1] The collision between the Irish and Roman ecclesiastics in England shows the extreme tenacity with which the island monks clung to their national rules, and Columbanus was equally obstinate. Nevertheless, he appealed to the Pope; but the terms of the appeal were not promising, for though he resorts to the Pope on the Scriptural principle, "Ask thy father, and he shall teach thee," he proceeds to anticipate his decision. "How can you who are so wise, whose light guides the universe, follow the cycle of Victorius, and celebrate a dark Easter? You no doubt respect the authority of your predecessor Leo, but remember that a living dog is better than a dead lion." The Irish saint proceeds further to ask what the Pope thinks about bishops ordained by simony, of whom many exist in that province; and also what one is to do with monks who, for the sake of leading a more perfect life, abandon their monasteries in spite of their abbots and their vows. Columbanus, as a man of learning, begs of the Pope some further commentaries on Scripture besides those which he has read with so much advantage.

But the tone of the epistle was so uncourtly that we cannot greatly wonder that no answer was received to it, or to another which followed; the rather because the prevalence of simony in Gaul was too well known at Rome already. But it is impossible to deny our sympathy to the appeal which the saint addressed to an assembly of Gallic bishops. "I ask but one thing, fathers of the council, that you would bear in charity with my ignorance, or, as some call it, my pride. As I was not the originator of this usage, suffer me to

[1] See Skene's "Celtic Scotland," vol. ii. p. 7 *et seq.*

follow it in the depths of these woods, by the bones of seventeen of my brethren. Suffer us to live among you in Gaul, since, as we hope, we shall one day live together in heaven. But if God ordain that you should drive us hence, I shall submit, and say with the prophet, 'Take me and cast me into the sea.'" The Irish usage was, however, condemned.

The same unyielding spirit brought Columbanus into collision with Brunehilde and her grandson Theodoric, who reverenced him as Herod reverenced John the Baptist, but would not suffer his interference with the royal pleasures. He was driven from his monastery, not by force, but by the prayers of the soldiers, distracted between fear of him and of their commanders. They conducted him to the Loire with the monks of Irish blood, and at Nantes he was embarked for Ireland. But the vessel was driven back to the shore. The incident was taken as a divine direction, and the saint and his companions were landed, and repaired to the court of Clotaire, king of Neustria, from whence he proceeded by way of the Rhine to Italy, and there, under the protection of the Lombard king, he founded the great abbey of Bobio. The traces and records of Irish Christianity are impressed upon the land to this day.

Columbanus never returned to Gaul, though he received a pressing invitation from Clotaire, who, by the defeat and death of Theodoric and Brunehilde, had become sole king of the Franks. The story of this Irish mission belongs henceforth to Italy.[1] But Luxeuil, peopled with Frenchmen, continued to flourish, and the rule of Columbanus, though destined to yield

[1] See "Six Months in the Apennines," by Margaret Stokes. Lond. 1892.

to the superior fitness of that of S. Benedict, had for a long time to come a vast influence upon Gallic monasticism. Nor were other Irish missions wanting. S. Fursey, who established great foundations, and was coadjutor to the Bishop of Paris, was but one of many.

Clotaire at last carried out the desire of Gregory the Great, and held a national council at Paris in the year 615. Seventy-nine bishops attended, and fourteen canons were passed, two of them establishing the true principles of episcopal appointment, already so often asserted by councils and neglected in practice. Most of the remaining canons concern the protection of the Church's property. The tenth canon goes so far as to establish the validity of wills made by ecclesiastical persons in favour of the Church, even though some legal formality be wanting. And we discern in this excessive care concerning earthly goods the source from which the abuses of the Church proceeded: the love of money is the root of all evil. The bishops and nobles claimed in this council the right of appointing judges for their own territories. And the king confirmed the proceedings by an ordinance, in which he carefully reserved the right of the king to authorise the consecration of bishops elected by the people. The bishops were become too powerful in secular affairs as well as spiritual to be appointed independently of the government.

Clotaire at the end of his reign associated with himself, probably by compulsion of his nobles, his son Dagobert, who became king of Austrasia, to which, at his father's death, were added Neustria and Burgundy; while his brother Heribert reigned in Aquitaine.

Dagobert was a pleasure-loving monarch, but a strong friend of the Church,[1] and wise enough to choose good ministers. The friendship of the good King Dagobert with the good Sant Eloi passed into song. Eloi, or Eligius, the skilful metal-worker and devoted Christian, is truly an attractive figure. But some of the records of the time display religion as very imperfect, even in its best examples. The chronicler of King Dagobert expects that though he did many things contrary to Church rule, and not as wise as they should have been, yet his alms to the poor, and the prayers of the saints whose shrines he enriched, will easily obtain his pardon. And the king proved that he himself had imbibed this teaching, when in solemn assembly of the states of his realm he published his intention of bequeathing, in order to merit the grace of God, all his private property to the churches of the saints founded during his reign in the kingdom.

The disciplinary canons of the Council of Chalons display an extraordinary amount of interference on the part of laymen with ecclesiastical functions. The fourth canon, which forbids the existence of two bishops in the same place, is doubtless due to collision between the royal authority and the election of the people, or the action of the comprovincial bishops. The eleventh canon forbids the civil magistrates to visit the churches and monasteries after the example of the bishops, the object of such visits being apparently the enjoyment of a good dinner at the expense of the Church.

[1] "The priest, in fact, was now king."—*Michelet, Hist. of France*, i. 63. But Martin, *Hist. de France*, ii. 143, is more exact: "Dagobert gave to the clergy with one hand what he took away with the other."

CHAPTER V.

THE CARLOVINGIANS.

Monastic rules—Relaxation of Church life—Charles Martel—Division of the wealth of the Church—Saracen invasion—Rome and the Carlovingians—Literature and education under Charlemagne—His interference in Church government—State of religion—Restoration of the Empire of the West.

MONASTERIES of the Benedictine rule began to multiply in this period. The house of St. Maur des Fossés was built, as we have noticed in a former page, upon the ruins of a stronghold of the Bagaudæ, and that of Fleury, otherwise called S. Benedict, on the Loire, was believed to possess the bones of that great saint himself, transported from the ruins of Monte Cassino. Thus the Benedictine order begins to take its place in France; but for the present that of S. Columbanus was more general,[1] and there was also a rule observed in many houses which was compounded of the two. This composite rule had the defect of omitting the manual labour, which formed so healthy a feature in the Benedictine system; this "rule of the Master" directed, on the contrary, that the lands of the monastery should be farmed out. These were observed with fervour, but many of the more ancient houses in

[1] Michelet's History of France, i. 67.

the south, Lerins itself among the number, had fallen into relaxation of life.

We read the ecclesiastical history of these times chiefly in the records of the councils and in the lives of the saints; but while these records give us many hints of evil, we cannot find in them an adequate picture of the vices of the time. There cannot be a doubt that when, in the early part of the eighth century, the government of Gaul fell into the hands of Charles Martel, he found the Church swollen with wealth and low in spiritual power. The doubtful title of Charles, and the wars which he was forced to wage, obliged him to attach the "*leudes*" to his cause, and the wealth of the Church afforded the means.

There were two possible methods of diverting the ecclesiastical wealth to the secular lords. One was the simple seizure of it for their benefit, another the actual appointment of them to ecclesiastical office, and the Mayors of the Palace adopted both expedients. The Frankish chiefs became proprietors of churches and monasteries, with the obligation, it is true, to maintain the monks and clergy and to repair the buildings; but it may be well conceived how little the untamed barbarians thought of any obligation beyond that of enjoying the wealth provided for them. The churches and religious houses, built probably with little of the solidity and skill of after times, fell into ruin, and the protection and instruction which the population had derived from the ecclesiastical occupants was given no more. But a still greater mockery was that of appointing to bishoprics and abbacies the hunters and

fighters of the German forests, who despised civilisation and its employments as the proper care of the effeminate Gallo-Roman.

In these high-handed proceedings the Mayors of the Palace had the aid and countenance of the Papacy. The Merovingian kings, before their monarchy had sunk into contempt, had been used to take part in ecclesiastical legislation and in the appointment of bishops. The Mayors of the Palace carried the system further, but this advance in power naturally fell to them in the abasement of the Church. They were the only authorities with whom the Papacy could connect itself, or through whom it could act. The period during which the Roman Empire ruled Gaul was the only period during which the Church of the country had approached the condition of a free Church in a free state. Under the Merovingians she had purchased her portion of secular power by conceding to the kings a share of ecclesiastical authority, and now she became so closely united with the State as to be but a department of its administration, and her property a portion of its domains. The condition of the Church under the first Carlovingians foreshows the condition to which the first Napoleon desired to reduce her. It has been maintained that the authority in the Church of France, conceded to the Mayors of the Palace by the Popes, was but a temporary expedient, but a growing secular power is little likely to give back authority which has been once conceded to it. The relations of Church and State in the eighth century, if not in the time of Clovis, laid the preparation for the conflicts

between secular and ecclesiastical power which the Middle Ages beheld; but whether the Pope and the ruler of the State combined, or whether they contended, the Church herself had lost all that power of self-government which was so actively exercised in her early centuries.

The municipal power fell, as we have shown, at the barbarian conquest into the hands of the bishops, and with the accumulation of their property they held up their heads among the chiefs. But this height of secular position made their places and titles the more acceptable to the nobles of Charles Martel, who, viewing these great positions from their worldly side, saw no reason whatever why they themselves should not fill them as well as another. It is no wonder that this great chief, with the contest between Christianity and Mohammedanism on his hands, forgot that in swelling his bands with warriors he was strangling the liberties of the Church, and wounding the very religion for which he fought.

The Saracens in their advance pillaged many Christian towns and many monasteries, Luxeuil among the rest. For the moment the fighting bishops whom Charles had appointed seemed more in place than spiritual persons, and Sens and Auxerre were both saved by the warlike measures of their prelates; but the victory of Poitiers removed that argument for secularity. The destruction of the Saracens was so complete, and the loss of the Christian army so small, that it was attributed to miracle. Viewing its effects in a larger way, no Christian will refuse to see in it the hand of God.

While Charles was performing his appointed task, the Saxon Winfried, better known as S. Boniface, was doing his mission work in Germany; and he played no unimportant part for France by the brave attempts which he made, unsuccessful though he thought them, to Christianise her debased Church. The saintly man found uncongenial companions in the ecclesiastics of the court. His letters show that, while he needed the protection of the Franks for his work among the wild tribes, his intercourse with the Frankish court and the ecclesiastics who resorted there was repulsive to his Christian mind.

In one of the letters of the Pope to S. Boniface we find him entitling Charles Martel "the patrician." This application of an ancient Roman title indicates the project which had sprung up in the mind of the Pope of finding protection against the Italian enemies of the Church in the vigorous family which had established its domination over the Franks and Germans. The idea of Rome as the seat of empire was still alive in Europe. Perhaps the Pope, if he had possessed the temporal power to which his successors attained, might have shrunk from establishing any heir to the imperial title except himself. But this was impossible in the eighth century. Though the dignity of the Pope consisted in no small degree of the remembrance of departed empire clinging to the city and concentrated on its chief inhabitant, yet it was still too separate from earthly monarchy, too little used to interference with the temporal government of the world to claim the vacant throne for itself. The next best thing was

that it should, by its apostolic power and its Roman position, endow with the vague and vast dignity of empire a line of princes fit to champion the giver of such gifts with the temporal sword. The need was pressing, and the appeals of the Pope for help against the Lombards are piteous cries from the oppressed rather than dignified offers from one who has more to give than to receive. Still, the compact was well understood; but before it came to be carried out Charles Martel was dead.

Of his sons, Carloman was heir of Austrasia and Germany; Pepin of Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence. Both of them were well disposed to promote a moral reform in the Church. Carloman found ready to his hand an excellent minister of reformation in the person of S. Boniface. A letter from the saint to the Pope informs him of the prince's intention, and asks the Pope's judgment upon the abuses of the Frankish Church, where some of the clergy were given up to lust, and some drunkards, and some sportsmen and warriors. A council was convened, and Carloman propounded on his own authority, in concert with his nobles and bishops, a scheme of reform. Pepin, on his part, called a council at Soissons for Neustria and Burgundy, where the canons of reformation were again published; but little success followed. Boniface compares himself to a dog who can do nothing but bark while the house of his master is pillaged. Carloman gave up the contest and became a monk at Monte Cassino. Pepin remained, and presently, with the consent of the Pope, the last Merovingian king was deprived of his nominal

authority, and the royal title passed to the man who held the power. Pepin was consecrated king at Soissons by S. Boniface.

This prince had expelled the last of the Saracens from Southern France when Pope Stephen took refuge with him from the troubles at home and invited his aid in Italy. The visit was paid, the Lombards were subdued, and the conqueror endowed the Roman See with the exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis, a territory neighbouring to Rome; the beginning of the temporal power of the Popes. An embassy from the Roman Emperor of the East to claim this territory for himself received the blunt reply that it was not for love of the Emperor that Pepin had conquered it. It must, however, be remembered that the Popes did not receive the absolute sovereignty of these territories, but only the property of them, with the rights and duties which, according to the ideas of the time, were involved in property. Nor was even the Carlovingian prince himself sole sovereign. Side by side with both Pope and king remained the Senate and people of Rome, as they had remained beside the Cæsars. It was in the struggles of after times that these phantom shapes finally disappeared, and the Pope and Emperor were left to settle their pretensions between themselves. The Pope was victor, and remained sovereign prince in the territory of which in the eighth century he had been only proprietor.

The king of the Franks stood arbiter between various claimants to Italy. The Emperor at Constantinople was desirous of restoring his authority over

Rome. The Lombards wanted to maintain their position in the fertile northern plains, and to extend it over the territory so recently lost, and the Pope trembled for his fate if either of these powers should obtain the Frankish alliance. Literary and artistic presents reached Pepin from Rome. The works of Dionysius the Areopagite and Aristotle, clocks, liturgical books, and especially such as taught the use of Gregorian chants, serve to indicate the royal taste. He loved the Roman ecclesiastical music for itself, and saw in its use among the churches of Gaul a valuable help to Church unity. But neither his efforts nor those of Charlemagne in the same direction produced liturgical, or even musical, uniformity between France and Rome.

The question which most employed the Church of that day was the use of images in churches. The dynasty which ruled at Constantinople was iconoclast to fanaticism. Every effort was made to obtain the concurrence of the Franks in this doctrine, and the question was considered in a council which Pepin summoned at Gentilly. At the same time, the introduction of the clause Filioque, by this time widely used in the Creed, was argued. We do not possess the Acts of this council, but we know that the efforts of the Easterns were unsuccessful in both directions, and that the proposal of the Emperor to marry his son to Gisele, the daughter of Pepin, was rejected. Pepin soon afterwards died, bequeathing his kingdom to his sons Charles and Carloman.

Few great Churchmen except Boniface adorned the reign of Pepin. The secular use of the appointments

and property of the Church by Charles Martel had drained her of her spiritual force. The name of S. Chrodegang, however, is to be remembered, not only for his saintly life, but for the rule which he established in his diocese of Metz for clergy living together in what we should call a clergy-house. They were called canons, and the institution had a great prevalence and a most wholesome effect for some centuries. The rule was a severe one, adapted from that of S. Benedict with such changes as should fit it for the use of secular clergy. By this time the rule of S. Benedict prevailed in most monasteries of Gaul, and when this modification of it spread among the secular clergy, the dominion which it exercised was indeed immense.

Carloman died after a reign of three years, and Charlemagne remained the sole monarch of the Franks. We must leave to general history the doings of this famous prince in the world of war and conquest; but his reign made no less an era in the history of the Church.

The first relations between Charlemagne and the Papacy were unpromising. The king of the Lombards offered his daughter to the Frank, and the alliance was favoured by the queen-mother. The Pope made vehement efforts to prevent it, and on Christian principles would have had an unanswerable argument in the fact that the young king was already married. In the eyes of a Frankish king, however, this objection was not final, and the Lombard marriage took place, but only to be repudiated in the same year, when Charlemagne married a third wife.

Pope Adrian I. was an abler diplomatist than his predecessor, and under his impulse Charlemagne determined on war with the Lombards and an invasion of Italy. The siege of Pavia was left to the care of Bernhard, the uncle of the king, while he himself paid a visit to Rome. There he was received with the pomp and splendour which becomes no city so much as Rome, and on his departure the Pope presented him with a book. It was a collection of canons, in which the pontiff had written a glowing eulogy in the form of an acrostic on the king's name.

The constant wars which Charlemagne maintained in every part of Europe render it difficult to understand how he found time for his learned pursuits. He received the literary impulse from Italy. His architecture was copied from the Roman. He prosecuted the study of Latin, and strove to purify the language from barbarian accretions. His reign was a species of renaissance, and the revival of Roman studies and ideas was so widespread that it seemed at last naturally to demand a revival of the Empire itself.

Some of the best scholars who helped this movement, as well as many of the noblest missionaries who worked among the heathen of Germany, came from the British isles. Alcuin, the chief of the whole literary movement, was an Englishman, and two learned Irishmen were among the king's best schoolmasters. An examination of the pupils of one of these is recorded as having been conducted by the king himself. He inspected the exercises of the lads, and found that, while the low-born had made astonishing progress, the sons

of the nobles had little to show. Whereupon the great man promised the youths of the people, if they completed their education in the like spirit, his bishoprics and rich monasteries, assuring the others that he set little store by their nobility or their good looks, and that if they did not amend they should never have anything from Charles.[1]

In the year 787 Charlemagne addressed a circular letter to bishops and abbots directing the restoration of the schools in churches and religious houses, and exhorting the clergy themselves to apply their minds to learning. Alcuin, having directed the school of the palace up to 790 A.D., retired to the Abbey of S. Martin at Tours, to which the king had presented him. There he founded a school which sent forth many distinguished men, and was the mother of famous academies. Those of Corbey, S. Denis, and Luxeuil were of equal reputation. There was much lost ground to be regained, for one of Charlemagne's proclamations declares that the cultivation of letters had almost entirely perished through the carelessness of previous generations. He claims that he has by his own example impelled to the study of letters all whom he could reach, and has already corrected exactly the books of the Old and New Testament, which had been corrupted by the ignorance of copyists. The allusion is to the correction of the copies of the Latin Bible in which Alcuin busied himself, and in which his master took great interest.

During the reign of Charlemagne the ancient Gallic

[1] Michelet, Hist. of France, i. 85.

canon of the Mass gave way to the Roman—an immense liturgical loss. But while the richer and more primitive Eucharistic form was thus removed in favour of one more meagre and modern, a great many national characteristics remained in other portions of the divine offices. Charlemagne even imposed upon the Gallic Church a lectionary, or book of readings from the Fathers, drawn up under his own orders. And Alcuin compiled a missal in which many prayers were added to those of the Roman form; and a sacramentary of thirty-two different Masses—that is to say, thirty-two different collections of collects, private prayers, prefaces, and post-communion prayers, suited to various seasons.

Charlemagne was also a great church-builder. The style of his architecture was a debased classical. The building, however, on which he expended his best care was not French; it was the German Cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle. It was his desire to extend the uniform system of Roman chanting throughout his dominions, but the Italian musicians whom Pope Leo III. sent into France to train the Gallic churches set themselves purposely to teach a diversity in various places, that the Roman song might remain without a rival. The ruse was discovered and the authors severely punished; but Roman musicians were so little to be trusted to disseminate their art, that the Pope requested Charlemagne to send Gallic clerks to Rome for instruction.

The most important sphere of Charlemagne's influence upon the Church of France is found in the ecclesi-

astical legislation of the Capitularies.[1] These ordinances did not issue from ecclesiastical assemblies, but they concern themselves with the most intimate details of Church administration. The English Church itself is in no wise so liable to the interference of the State as was that of the empire of Charlemagne.

Bishops are directed to make careful examination of the priests of their dioceses, whether they maintain the true faith, baptize correctly, and understand the prayers of the Mass, chant the psalms properly, with the right division of verses; understand the Lord's Prayer, and explain it to the people; sing the glorias, with reverences, and join the congregation in the tersanctus. "It has pleased us," says the king to the bishops, "to apprise your reverences that each of you in his diocese ought to take care that respect is paid to the churches and the altars, and that no one talk in church of secular affairs. We require of you also to see that the canons and the monks observe their rule, and the ministers of the altar honour their calling by their lives. The clerks and monks must gather round them in their schools not merely children of the lower class, but the children of freemen."

The Missi Dominici were directed to see that the bishops themselves, as well as the priests, knew the canons and preached with diligence. The Council of Tours, held by order of Charlemagne, requires of bishops, not only to read the Gospel and the Epistles of S. Paul, but as far as possible to know them by heart. No bishop must be ignorant of the canons and

[1] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, ii. 277.

S. Gregory's "Pastoral Care," and the commentaries of the Fathers must be familiar to them. A bishop must not be a lover of luxurious repasts. Pilgrims and poor people must be his guests, and he must eschew stage-plays and the chase. No priest is to be allowed to pass from the church for which he was ordained to another. Bishops are to deliver homilies on necessary doctrine in the Romance or Frankish tongue, so that all may understand them. These high requirements must not induce us to suppose that the clerical character had reached a high standard at this period, for a canon of the Council of Chalons runs: "It is said that some of our brethren oblige those who are about to be ordained to make oath that they are worthy of ordination, that they will never transgress the canons, and will obey the bishop who ordained them. As this oath is perilous, we have unanimously determined that it shall be suppressed." However, the promise of obedience to the bishop of the diocese was retained.

But the exactions which the bishops themselves imposed on their clergy were among the greatest impediments to reformation. They had become secular lords, and their vassals were important contingents to the royal armies. Sometimes they themselves appeared in battle, and the lay lords made supplication to Charlemagne that the bishops would keep out of earthly conflicts, since the desire of the soldiers to guard them from danger, and the dismay which the wound or fall of a bishop in battle diffused, were more dangerous than their aid was useful; and this request was followed

by a royal decree forbidding bishops to take part in war.

Among the episcopal admonitions to the clergy none are more remarkable than those of Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans. He solemnly implores the priests to read the Bible with assiduity, and, when they cease from study, to apply themselves at once to manual labour, since by manual labour the body is kept under, and a livelihood is gained with something over for the poor. Drunkenness is carefully to be shunned; meals are not to be taken in public-houses. There must be no attempt to attract parishioners who belong to another parish; any priest transgressing this rule is to be degraded or subjected to long penance in prison. From these directions we see that the priests of the time had to work for their bread, and that the bishops had the power of inflicting temporal penalties upon them. Nevertheless, priests are strictly forbidden to receive fees for performing any spiritual function. It appears from another clause that godparents, other than those who stood at baptism, used to present young people for confirmation, and that this act, like the presentation of children at the font, was regarded as establishing a relationship, not only between these godparents and the children, but also between them and the children's kindred by blood. Marriage between such persons was prohibited.

Public penance had fallen into disuse during the wild days of the seventh century. Charlemagne endeavoured to revive it. Some wise words among the canons of the third Council of Chalons expressed the principles

on which the doctrine of penance was rested. "Some say that one should only confess one's sins to God, others that it is needful to confess to the priest. These two kinds of confession are practised in the Church with great advantage. It is good to confess one's sins to God, who is the only one who can remit sins, and to say to him with David, 'Mine unrighteousness have I not hid. I said I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and so Thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin.' But it is at the same time necessary that we should confess our sins to each other, as the Apostle says, and pray for one another that we may be saved. Confession made to God effaces sins, and that made to the priest teaches us how we should correct them. In the penances which they impose priests must follow the ancient canons, the authority of Scripture, and the custom of the Church, and not those little books called penitentials, the errors of which are certain, while their authors are uncertain." Strange to find that even then the consciences both of the clergy and of the faithful were perplexed by anonymous and unauthorised manuals. The good Theodulf thus expounds his doctrine of repentance: "Every day in our prayers—once, twice, or as often as we can—we should confess our sins to God. The confessions which we make to the priests are of great help to us by reason of the counsels we receive, the salutary practices of penance which are imposed on us, the prayers which we make, and which the priest makes for us; but the confession which we utter to God helps us in this sense, that the more we remember our sins, the more God forgets them." The

same good prelate warns his people of the danger of lightly approaching the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and the danger of keeping from it too long. The common rule of frequent communion has no exception, except that of excommunicated persons on the one hand who may not receive till their penance is over, and those on the other who live under a religious rule and communicate almost daily. All Christians must receive on Maundy Thursday. The general practice seems to have been to receive thrice a year; but Theodulf desires a more frequent reception in his diocese, namely, upon all Sundays in Lent, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Eve, and Easter Day.

But while this considerable standard of practice is laid down in some dioceses, we find that in others Charlemagne had in the first place to compel those who were in enjoyment of the revenues of bishoprics to become bishops in earnest by receiving consecration.

One of the most pressing duties which a bishop had to perform was to reduce to order the vagabond priests called Acephali, who were in charge of no duty. The bishop was to excommunicate, and if necessary to imprison them. The existence of these discreditable clergy was due to the misconduct of the bishops, who ordained them for the sake of gain to themselves or to the Church. It is undoubted that considerable property accrued to the Church in this way; but the Council of Chalons directed that in such cases it should return to the heirs. The more fruitful source of endowment was voluntary gift—if that gift be voluntary which is given in the hope of obtaining forgiveness of sins.

A very strict law of Sunday observance was laid down for general use, and that not merely by the rule of the Church, but of the State. Charlemagne was requested to publish an ordinance upon the subject, and did so. Fasting also was strictly enjoined, especially in Lent; the Ember Days and Vigils were not imposed till the ninth century. On fast-days there must be almsgiving, and what is withdrawn from dinner must be distributed, and not kept for one's own supper. Some think they fast because they abstain from food till nones: they must abstain till vespers. Modern religion has found means to soften this rule by giving permission in Lent to say vespers before mid-day; but no such expedient was then thought of. During times of fast it was necessary to abstain from quarrels and law-suits; and a fast not accompanied by prayers, watching, and alms was regarded as useless.

Certain laws for the restraint of superstition were laid down which have been too often forgotten in later times. It was forbidden to venerate martyrs and saints whose history was not certainly known. Writings of doubtful origin—for instance, a certain letter which some impostors pretended to have fallen from heaven—were not to be read. None were to go on pilgrimage except in a repentant and humble spirit, and with the advice of their parish priest.

The reign of Charlemagne saw the last of the ancient Chorepiscopi, who at this time had become in the episcopal order very much what the Acephali above mentioned were in that of priests. They wandered here and there, exercising episcopal functions without pos-

sessing jurisdiction, and the clergy who had been ordained by diocesan bishops despised those who had received their orders from a Chorepiscopus. Charlemagne consulted the Pope, and, with the full approval of the bishops of Gaul, it was determined that no more of this class of bishops should be made, and those already existing should perform no episcopal functions.

In the year 800 Charlemagne was crowned Emperor, and the power of the Cæsars, long in abeyance in the West, but never forgotten, was revived in his person. This re-embodiment of a great idea, which existed in the minds of men wherever the Roman Empire had extended, was not without significance for any country in Christendom. But it was not in France that it had its special power, and its very existence shows us how great a mistake it is to suppose Charlemagne a French monarch. The empire was, indeed, rather a separation than a bond of union between him and France. This separation was to become actual fact in the time of his descendants. His whole course of action and legislation show him to us in France as a king and something more. It is he who appears as the final judge of appeal, and we do not find room in the genuine capitularies for the interference of Papal Rome, even in the degree in which previous ages had exemplified it, much less in the excess to which, in the next century, the False Decretals raised it. The addition of the Filioque to the Nicene Creed in the Churches of Spain and France, while the Pope refused (for the time) to insert it in that of Rome, was a remarkable instance of independence of Papal authority in

doctrine.[1] The absolute difference of opinion on the question of images, which Charlemagne and all his subjects, ecclesiastical and civil, displayed and maintained towards the Pope and the second Council of Nicæa, had a similar aspect, and both together display a wondrous inconsistency with the Papal claims in matters of that nature which later days have developed.

And when, at the termination of his reign, Charlemagne associated his son Louis in the empire, he solemnly gave him charge in the Cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle to "govern well the churches of God;" while on the same occasion he placed the crown with which Louis was to be invested upon the altar, and bid him take it from thence and place it on his head. "My son, receive this crown," said the aged Emperor; "it is Christ that giveth it thee."

[1] The change made in the creed of the Church by the final victory of the Carlovingian over the Roman tradition is exaggerated by Professor Harnack, but the circumstance is in any case very noteworthy. See his "History of Dogma," 1893.

CHAPTER VI.

POWERS ROYAL EPISCOPAL, METROPOLITAN, AND PAPAL.

Louis le Debonnaire—Growth of the power of the bishops—Theology in the ninth century—Doctrine of the Eucharist—Rutramn—Godescalk and the doctrine of predestination—Capitularies of Hincmar—Contest between the Pope and the metropolitans—Forged decretals—1000 A.D.—Pontificate of Gerbert.

LOUIS the Debonair was a more consistent Christian than his father, and he had at all events resolution enough to purge the court of vice. As king of Aquitaine, he had worked a change for good in the manners of the clergy, and had especially devoted himself to the restoration of monasteries. But his mild virtues themselves placed him in the power of the ecclesiastics, who had little reason to be proud either of the results to him or to his subjects of the submission which he yielded. The Pope crowned Louis emperor in the Cathedral of Reims, on which occasion the monarch expounded in an address the principles on which he desired to reign and the reforms which he hoped to effect.[1] It is impossible to read it without sympathy, or without sadness to think how little of the goodly programme was carried out.

A council at Aix-la-Chapelle soon followed. The rules

[1] Michelet draws attention to the resemblance between the character of Louis the Debonair and S. Louis. Hist. of France, i. 88.

of S. Chrodegang for the canonical life were adapted for general use, and received such extension that in no long time every cathedral had its canons. The decrees of reformation passed at this council and enforced by the Emperor seem to have had more effect in reducing to order the pride and worldliness of the bishops than Charlemagne's efforts in the same direction; perhaps they were more sincere. And in the same year Louis sent forth a commission, consisting of the abbots of best repute in the kingdom, to visit all the monasteries of the realm. At the head of these visitors was the pious Benedict of Anianè, who had attracted the admiration of Louis in Aquitaine, and was now his chief adviser in the difficult task of amending the lax monastic life of France. The effort met with success in many quarters; but the monks of S. Denis were so refractory that the best of them were removed to another house, and the lawless left to bring their community into such a condition of confusion as obliged them to welcome a reform.

The measures which Louis had taken against the members of his own family, in order to secure his authority, weighed upon his conscience, and it is to be feared his spiritual advisers were more anxious to display their own ascendency than to guard the public respect for their sovereign. He submitted to open penance at the hands of the bishops in the presence of his people. But the exaltation of the clergy above their sovereign did not imply submission on their part to the Pope. The freedom which the Conference of Paris in 825 used with Eugenius II. on the subject of images

would have been impossible had the same doctrine of Papal authority which is now an article of faith, been prevalent in any form.

The pious clericalism of Louis was not fitted to maintain the encroachments of Charlemagne upon the liberties of the Church. Wala, Abbot of Corbey, was the first to give effective utterance to the complaints upon this point, for which there was too much reason. He laid down in the Assembly at Aix-la-Chapelle the distinction of the temporal and spiritual powers, without, however, any mention of the Pope. "The emperor and the king on one side is obliged, on pain of God's judgment, to administer the state without encroaching on what is beyond his competence. On the other hand, the bishops and ministers of the Church ought more especially to administer the things of God." With regard to the goods of the Church, which the Carlovingian kings had distributed among their warriors, and the restitution of which was said to be hindered by the necessities of the State, Wala suggested that a far better method of procuring assistance from the Church for the wants of the State would be that of a free subsidy, presented by the clergy, who might justly be expected to pay for the protection which the State afforded them. Wala proceeded to inveigh against the ill custom of giving away monasteries to lay lords, and demanded that bishoprics should be filled by the primitive and canonical rule of selection, and he attacked vigorously the undisciplined life of the chaplains of the palace. They were neither monks nor canons. Every community should follow either the canonical rule or

the monastic; and, if they lived by neither, they were mere Acephali.

A fourfold council of bishops ensued at Mayence, Paris, Lyons, and Toulouse. The Acts of the Paris assembly contain the usual admonitions against simony and the aggrandisement of episcopal families at the expense of the Church; the ungoverned conduct of the chaplains of royal and noble households; the pride of prelates, who treat the flock of God as their own property. These evils are traced to the cessation of provincial councils, which, by ancient rule, should be held twice a year; and the Emperor is informed that the abuses which he desires to abate have their root in the excessive intemperance of the prince in ecclesiastical affairs, and of the clergy in secular. Reform never will be complete till the bishops are free. Among the suggestions which the council present to the Emperor in his own sphere of duty is one for the establishment of public schools in three great cities of the empire, to follow up the educational work of his father, Charlemagne, and his own. The demand here expressed by the bishops led finally to the establishment of universities. The reports of the four councils were considered in a general "plaid" at Worms, whither the Pope sent a legate; but the Acts of this assembly are lost, and whatever reforms it may have ordered were forgotten amidst the troubles of the State.

The conduct of the bishops who acted with the rebels was marked by a peculiar degree of hypocrisy. They made their canonical powers the instrument of their political designs. In their proceedings the claim of an

essential superiority of the spiritual power to the temporal begins to make its appearance in France. The false account of the Emperor's penance, which they ventured to publish, stated that he "remitted to the bishops, to serve as testimony to posterity, the list of his sins, which they deposited on the altar. He then took off his baldric and placed it on the same altar, and then, having divested himself of his secular robes, he received from the bishops the habit of a penitent, with the imposition of hands. After the imposition of this great and solemn penance none can return to earthly warfare." The claim to impose such a penance implies an indirect power to dethrone a sovereign; but the insolence of the manifesto, as well as its known falsehood, awakened general indignation, and the Emperor was released, and solemnly reconciled to the Church, while Ebbo, Archbishop of Reims, was degraded for his share in the plot.

These were insolences of the episcopal order; but we view very differently the courage of Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, when he defends the ancient canons of the Gallic Church against the ambition of the Pope, and bitterly complains of those who make no account of ancient customs, sanctified by the use of ages, because they have not the approval of "Roman innovators." Thus early did Gallicanism and Ultramontanism begin their strife; but, before this contest was openly waged, that of the spiritual power against the secular had to be decided.

The spiritual power had largely the advantage in organisation, and in the recourse to the episcopal

judgment, so constantly made by princes and nobles in their mutual wars. The rough attempts at resistance to the march of the bishops' authority had little significance. "They governed," says Michelet, "under the triple title of bishops, magistrates, and great proprietors, and could contend with the Pope himself."[1]

Sergius II. named Drogo of Mayence his vicar beyond the Alps. The terms of the appointment were sufficiently arrogant. "We direct that he be acquainted without delay with all that is decided in provincial councils. If any one desires to appeal to the Apostolic See, let him address himself first to him, and come to me only when provided with letters from him. We delegate also to our brother, the Archbishop Drogo, our authority for the examination of bishops and abbots, saving always the primatial rights of the Universal See of Rome, and the rights of our spiritual son, the Emperor Clotaire."

Here, first in the annals of the Church of France, is mention made of any action of the Pope in the appointment of bishops and abbots. The Popes, in sanctioning the usurpation of the Carlovingian kings upon the ancient rights of the people and comprovincial bishops, asserted a claim of approval for themselves, and having risen so high with the rise of the Carlovingian empire, they now hoped to rise higher still by its depression.

But affairs were not ripe for the forward step implied in the commission to Archbishop Drogo. The bishops of Charles the Bald made answer, that as to the prelature of Drogo, they dared not decide any-

[1] History of France, i. 97.

thing, except that they would wait for a council for Gaul and Germany, the most numerous that could be got together, in order to learn the opinion of the metropolitans and bishops, to which they neither would nor could make any resistance. "This national council never was held, and Drogo," says Archbishop Hincmar, "did not enjoy the honour he had sought, because those who were interested did not consent; a disappointment which he endured with patience for fear of scandalising his brethren and causing a schism."

Amidst the confusion of public affairs, the terrors of barbarian invasion, and the contentions of ecclesiastical interests, it might have been supposed that theology would be forgotten. But it was otherwise. The two controversies which have proved most difficult of decision in the Church were begun or revived in this age—the nature of the Presence in the Eucharist, and Predestination. It was the illustrious Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbey, who originated the discussion upon the former point. He laid down, in a work intended for the instruction of the half-Christianised Saxons of his monastic school, the true doctrine as he conceived it. His statement consisted of a strong assertion of the Real Presence, emphasised by the assertion that the Eucharistic Body of our Lord is the same which was born of the Blessed Virgin. The Real Presence met no question. It was the universal doctrine of the Church; and there was not in Paschasius' definition of it any such physical perplexities concerning substance and accident as afterwards were imported for the torment of souls and the confusion of

the Church. But the statement that the Eucharistic Body is the same which was born of the Blessed Virgin excited some doubt. The Aristotelian philosophy had begun to be studied with care, and subtle thinkers argued that the Body of the Lord received in the Holy Eucharist, though doubtless the same Body, could not be the same as to its manner of being with that which the Lord possessed on earth.

The Abbey of Corbey possessed at that time a young monk of high abilities named Ratramn. He differed from his illustrious abbot upon the point just named, and Charles the Bald, who loved theological questions, desired to have his ideas in a systematic form. Such was the origin of Ratramn's treatise on the Body and Blood of Christ, which played so important a part in the history of our own Reformation. Our limits do not permit us to treat of the import of Ratramn's work, much less of the opinions of the theologians who in after times professed to accept his doctrine. But Rabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda, and one of the most revered teachers of that age, held with Ratramn. He certainly did not conceive himself to be rejecting the doctrine of the Real Presence; he but placed himself among the number of those who allow that figure must not wholly be excluded, since the repulsive conception of a painful sacrifice in every Eucharist cannot be avoided without allowing that the sacrifice has a figurative element.[1]

[1] "Jure simul veritas et figura dicitur."—Paschasius Radbert *de Corp. et Sang Domini*, Migne, Patrol. Lat. cxx. 1278.

"Hoc est ergo manducare illius carnem et sanguinem bibere si in

The interminable question of Predestination was started by Godescalk. He was a Saxon by birth, and had been offered in his infancy at the monastery of Fulda. When come to years, he made an appeal to the Archbishop of Mainz against this disposal of his life, and his prayer was granted, as reason surely required; but it did not seem so to the Abbot Rabanus, who, as his manner was, composed a treatise on the point, in which he attempted to prove that such engagements, when made by parents or guardians for an infant, were obligations which in after life he was bound to satisfy. The Church, however, did not accept these views of what may be called human predestination. It would appear that Godescalk's objection was rather to Fulda in particular than to the monastic life, for he passed into France and was received into a religious house in

Christo maneat et Christus in illo qui percipit digne manere possit."—*Ibid.*, 1282.

"Spiritualiter hæc accipienda sunt et non carnaliter. Hoc sane nutrivit in nobis quod ex Deo natum est non quod ex carne et sanguine."—*Ibid.*, 1330.

"Quod jejuni communicanus satis provide fit ut dum sobrietas flagrat in corpore dum omnis fervor carnis quiescit et omnis animi sensus in intelligentiam et discernendi rationem fortius vigent illo prius cibo interior noster homo inebrietur."—*Ibid.*, 1231.

On the other hand—"Substantialiter nec panis Christus."—Ratamnus *de Corp. et Sang. Domini*, Patr. Lat. cxxi. 130).

"Fatebuntur igitur necesse est aut mutata esse secundum aliud quam secundum corpus ac per hoc non esse hoc quod in veritate ei dentur sed aliud quod non esse secundum propriam essentiam coernuntur. Aut si hoc profiteri noluerint compelluntur negare corpus esse sanguinemque Christi, quod nefas est non solum dicere sed etiam cogitare."—*Ibid.*, 134.

"At quia confitentur et corpus et sanguinem Dei esse nec hoc esse potuisse nisi facta in melius commutatione neque ista commutatio corporaliter sed spiritualiter facta sit necesse est jam ut figurate facta esse dicatur sub velamento corporei panis corporeique vini spirituale corpus spiritualisque sanguis existit."—*Ibid.*, 134–5.

the diocese of Soissons. There he applied himself with great diligence to the study of S. Augustine. He was in communication with some of the best thinkers of the time, and Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières, gave him the excellent advice not to waste his time and energies upon thorny points. "Let us rather devote ourselves to cultivating the vast fields of Holy Scripture. When we do not search into what is above our powers, God will perhaps enable us to know it."

The peculiar doctrine of Godescalk was comprised under three heads, and "The Three Questions" formed the current name for his teaching. 1. The reprobate are irrecoverably predestinated to eternal death. 2. Jesus Christ did not die for all men without exception. 3. The free-will of man was destroyed by the fall. Rabanus heard of these excesses of his former pupil, and addressed a treatise in the form of a letter to a friend, in which he vindicated the name of Augustine from the accusation of favouring such teaching. Godescalk responded by a treatise in which Rabanus was accused of semi-Pelagianism. Charles the Bald convened an ecclesiastical tribunal consisting of twelve bishops and a number of accredited theologians, at which Godescalk was condemned, deposed from the ministry, and beaten with rods. Bodily chastisement might seem a form of argument ill adapted to expel Predestinarian views, but it must be remembered that the rule of S. Benedict sanctioned such penances.

Godescalk, in a solemn address to God, prays that he may be allowed, in proof of his doctrine, to plunge himself in succession into vessels of boiling water,

grease, oil, and pitch. The offer proves that he was a fanatic and not a thinker, and, to the credit of the good sense of the time, he was not permitted to try such a proof.

In no long time there was scarce a man of learning in the schools and monasteries who had not made his contribution to the discussion of the three questions, and finally the opinions of Godescalk formed an additional element in the dispute between the Pope and the French metropolitans, of whom Hincmar was the head. His controversies did not hinder this great prelate from careful oversight of his clergy, and we gather from his capitularies a notion of the amount of knowledge which a priest of the time was expected to possess, and of the customs he observed. He should understand the meaning of the Creed and Lord's Prayer according to the tradition of the Fathers; he should know by heart the preface of the Canon of the Mass and the Canon itself, be able to read distinctly the Prayers, the Epistle and Gospel, and pronounce the words of the Psalms, distinguishing the verses. He should learn them by heart, together with the Canticles and the symbol of S. Athanasius.

The portion of the bread offered by the faithful, which remains unconsecrated, must be cut in pieces and preserved in a proper vessel, to be distributed after the Mass to the faithful who have not communicated. Every morning, after having said matins, the priest shall recite prime, terce, sext, and none, and this shall not prevent his also having them chanted by his scholars at the proper hours, so far as may be. Then he shall

say Mass, visit the sick, and go to work in the fields till dinner-time if he have not parochial work to do. This is the first mention which we find of the obligation of reciting the canonical hours.

If clergy meet together for a repast, the doyen, or eldest among them, shall say the prayers and bless the meat. They shall sit according to their dignity, and a grace shall be said before each dish; and when the clergy meet together on the first of each month, they should not, after the sacred mysteries and the conference, sit down to a repast which is an expense, and sends them back late to their parishes with more injury than profit from the meeting. These rules for clerical meetings in the Dark Ages would be considered severe in the nineteenth century. The question which the rural dean is to ask of the priests in his deanery are very searching, extending to all the details of parish work, and the condition of every building and instrument employed.[1]

Hincmar had much trouble with certain presbyters whom his predecessor Ebbo had ordained after his deposition; and we possess a detailed account of the Synod of Soissons, which decided upon their case, where all the documents were exhibited and read at every stage of the inquiry. These clerks were degraded, but, as a matter of course, they appealed to Rome, and it seems to have been equally of course in this period that they were favourably received by the Pope.

[1] The capitularies levelled against the intemperate meetings of barbarian guilds are quoted by Aug. Thierry, *Considerations sur l'Histoire de France*, ch. vi.

Such was the growth of episcopal power, that when the kingdom of Charles the Bald was offered by a powerful conspiracy to Louis the German, and his troops had forsaken him, he was kept upon the throne by the determination of his bishops. They were well aware that the aim of the secular monarchs was to reduce their bishoprics to the position of fiefs, but they argued against Louis: "We bishops, consecrated to the Lord, are not men of this world, to submit ourselves to any one in vassalage and bind ourselves to him by oath. The hand which has been anointed with the sacred chrism, and which out of bread and wine mixed with water makes the Body and Blood of the Lord by prayer and the sign of the cross, cannot be extended for a profane oath, and it were a crime in a bishop to use for such an oath that tongue which is the key of heaven." But while we read these awful claims of spiritual power, we are extremely conscious that secular property and grandeur had no small part in fostering this pride, and in securing the submission which it received.

The crowning example of spiritual self-assertion in Europe was the power of the Pope, which, like the rest, advanced not by the force of either pure spirit or mere worldliness, but by a mixture of both. It was necessary that the representative of ecclesiastical power should silence the competing claims of his clerical brethren. In the age of which we are now treating, Rome is engaged in subduing rival ecclesiastics. The time has not arrived for her, in the character of undisputed head of the clerical power, to try conclusions with

secular authority. For the present the Papal contests with kings are for moral ends, and have all our sympathy. Lothaire II., king of Lorraine, was married to Theutberga, but was infatuated with passion for Waldrada. To obtain her in marriage he accused his innocent wife of abominable crime, and forced the unhappy woman to declare herself guilty. But Pope Nicholas I. was aware of the true facts, and maintained Theutberga's cause with untiring resolution. Some interested support for the royal divorce was obtained among the bishops, but the great Hincmar was firmly opposed to it.

The contest was continued into the next Papal reign, and the unhappy king died at Placentia very soon after having taken the Blessed Sacrament from the hands of the Pope, in solemn testimony of good intentions which he never intended to carry out.

In all other transactions in which Hincmar and the Popes took part they were uniformly on opposite sides. The department of learning to which Hincmar had especially applied himself was the canon law, and in this he was unrivalled. His character was fearless and steadfast, and the rights of metropolitans, to whose rank he belonged, found in him a resolute defender; but the cause was hopeless when once the Pope had added to his other advantages the authority of the Forged Decretals. What the point in discussion between them was we find well stated by Hincmar in reference to the case of his unruly suffragan, the Bishop of Soissons. "Far from us be the thought of making so little of the privileges of the Pontiff of the Holy See

of Rome as to wish to weary your authority with all the disputes which should be ruled and determined by the metropolitans in the provincial synods. If there arises regarding the bishops any question the decision of which we do not find certainly and expressly in the sacred canons, and which therefore cannot be judged in a provincial synod, it is then that we ought to have recourse to the oracle of God, that is to say, to the Apostolic See. Likewise, if in a cause of importance a bishop has not appealed to the decision of judges chosen by himself, or if, when judged and condemned, he thinks his cause good and appeals to the Bishop of Rome, considering it just to have it revised, then it is a duty for those who have examined the cause to write to the Sovereign Pontiff and remit it to his decision."

But the Popes desired to be judges of the first instance instead of judges of appeal, and in this ambition they were as sure of the good wishes of the bishops as of the opposition of the metropolitans. A distant judge, to whom the circumstances of the case must be unknown, was not so formidable as a tribunal consisting of a metropolitan and suffragans on the spot.

It is in the case of the Bishop of Soissons that the Forged Decretals are for the first time quoted by a Pope. The destruction of the rights of metropolitans is the very object with which this document was prepared, and the above words of Hincmar may serve to show how distinct was the advance which Papal pretensions were making. A second cause in which he attempted to resist the Pope was that of his own

nephew and namesake, Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, who had received what we should call a renewal fine from a certain Laidon, to grant him a fief which his father had enjoyed, and for no just cause had resumed the fief without returning the fine. Charles the Bald for this offence confiscated the whole property of the See, except the church, the palace, and the house of the canons. The bishops of the province, with very doubtful right, claimed the decision of the case from the royal courts, and the Bishop of Laon was condemned, and appealed to Rome. The bishops, however, wrote to the Pope to protest beforehand against a decision to restore him, and Charles on his part replied to the reproachful letters of the Pope, "Write to me in a style suitable to your ministry and dignity, and I shall receive your advice with submission." Upon this occasion the Pope retraced his steps. But when Charles the Bald became Emperor and protector of the Roman Church, John VIII. sent two legates into France, and in solemn council at St. Denis, in presence of the Emperor, named the Bishop of Sens to the office of apostolic delegate in the Church of France to convene councils and treat of important affairs. The bishops accepted the appointment, saving the rights of the metropolitans, and could not by any efforts of the Emperor be induced to withdraw the qualification.

Strange to say, all this controversial activity was displayed amid the ravages of Saracens and Northmen. The latter were the chief foes of France, and by the end of the ninth century they had reduced it to desolation.

The tenth century was the darkest and most sorrowful period of French Church history. The temporal miseries of the time occupied men's minds, and the wars and oppressions of the period bore with special severity upon the institutions on which the higher life of the country depended. The monasteries were plundered by the foreign invaders and used by the nobles of the land for their own gain or the enrichment of their favourites. The same is true of the bishoprics and all ecclesiastical offices. Priests and people, without power to secure or defend their secular liberty, were incapable of using the means of enlightenment and purification which the ancient system of the Church had provided; yet the tenth century, which might seem a mere seething confusion, was full of the seeds and elements of future institutions. The feudal system was shaping itself; the lust of power, as well as the necessities of defence, impelled the nobles to house themselves in strong castles; and when these had been built, they were used at once for domination over the surrounding people throughout as wide an area as the power of neighbouring barons permitted it to extend; and even if the domineering temper of the nearest noble could have permitted the poor man to remain undisturbed in his humble freedom, he would have been assailed by other tyrants, and compelled to seek protection from a stronger hand. Thus a general system of fagging obtained, and the well-known evils and mitigations which were found in fagging at schools prevailed in the feudal system. The master allowed none except himself to tyrannise over his dependants.

When, towards the end of the tenth century, Hugh Capet, the representative of a house long eminent in the wars of the time, took the sceptre of France from the feeble hands of the last Carlovingian, the population of the country was divided into two classes, the lords and the serfs.

The condition of the Church of France in the course of the century is known to us from the canons of the Council of Troslei, held A.D. 909.[1] "Of all the monasteries which existed in France, some have been burnt by the Pagans, others have been pillaged and almost wholly demolished; those of which any remains exist have preserved no part of their regular discipline. We see in the monasteries men and women: lay abbots, with their wives, their children, their servants, and their dogs." The remedy which the council suggests is to cease from appointing lay abbots; but while it was easy and obvious to suggest such a course, the power was wanting to enforce it.

A widespread impression existed that the second Advent was at hand. Such a belief, in a soberer form, is involved in the Christian faith, and at other periods far less wretched and more enlightened than this it has been enthusiastically embraced by Christian people; but the belief that the thousandth year from Christ would see the end of the dispensation had an apparent support in the Apocalypse, and at no other epoch has the assurance been carried so largely into the affairs of the world. Some repaired to Palestine as the scene of the last judgment; others gave their property to

[1] Hefelé, *Conciliengesch.*, French trans., vi. 146.

monasteries or became monks. An eclipse sent people in crowds to the caverns and rocks. Houses, palaces, and churches fell to ruin. It was not worth while to repair them when the destruction of all buildings was so close. All kinds of superstitions prevailed; the human fancy ran riot; the very lives of the saints, filled as many of them were with miracles in their original form, were altered and enlarged with more wonders, to satisfy the prevailing taste for the marvellous; while, on the other hand, many romances and fabliaux of a very different character owed their origin to these unchastened times. And yet, even in this evil age, councils of the Church were held where an earnest metropolitan was found to summon them, and some pious Christians shone like scattered lights, and studied their Bibles for comfort.

A spiritual conquest of vast importance for the faith was made in the conversion of the Normans to Christianity. Something was done in this direction by missionary efforts, but it was found that baptism meant little to those rude warriors. And to the question what penance was to be imposed on such men, Pope John IX. made answer that he would approve of the application of the canons to them with all strictness if they were not so new in the faith. The missionaries themselves were the best judges of what their converts were capable. If they could find any whose fervour was sufficient to induce them to submit to canonical penance, they should inflict it.

But the general conversion of the Normans was a condition of the treaty by which they were put in pos-

session of Normandy. It is probable that having been roving freebooters without home for so many years, they had little of their original religion to give up, and their acceptance of Christianity was not burdensome. But if Rollo and his followers were not very good Christians, they soon developed an extraordinary faculty for peace and order, and religion came in company. Normandy was in no long time a model to France for obedience to law, both human and divine.

The latter part of the century saw a considerable reformation in the monasteries, the state of which was appalling. Of this movement the great Abbey of Cluny was the originator. William, Duke of Normandy, the successor to Rollo, took part in the work, rebuilt the Abbey of Jumiéges, and would himself have taken the habit had not his spiritual advisers deterred him. The supply of pious men from Ireland was not yet exhausted; Kadroé led a body of twelve Irish monks into France. Among the monasteries which opposed the most vehement resistance to reformation was that of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés. It could not be subdued until the secular arm was invoked. Burcard, Count of Paris, solicited the monastery as a fief from Hugh Capet. The request was granted, and the Count committed the reform of his dependency to S. Mayeul from Cluny, warning all who would not submit to reformation to retire from the house.

Thus laboured the monastic reformers, and wherever they succeeded in recalling a religious house to the first zeal of its founders, the monastic school was

revived. But among all the intellects of the century, Gerbert was pre-eminent.[1] He was born during the first half of the tenth century, of poor parents, among the mountains of Auvergne, and being left an orphan, was educated in the monastery of Aurillac. Having acquired what was there to be learned, he asked permission to quit the monastery and visit the most celebrated seats of education. Spain was famous for its schools, and Gerbert was said not only to have visited its places of Christian learning, but to have penetrated to Seville and Cordova and acquired the deeper science to be found among the Saracens and Jews. His knowledge of mathematics and astronomy acquired for him the fame of a magician. From Spain he repaired to Rome and became acquainted with the Emperor Otho the Great, who was then in the city. The Pope retained him to teach mathematics and music, but his desire to study logic brought him back to France, where the Cathedral school of Reims was intrusted to him. His range of study was not confined to ecclesiastical subjects, but he taught poetry from the works of the great Latin authors. During a second sojourn in Italy he held the abbacy of Bobio, from whence he came back to France, but with so fixed an intention of returning to Bobio, that he left behind there some of his books and an organ which was intended as a present for his early friends at Aurillac.

On July 3, 987, Hugh Capet[2] was consecrated king

[1] Michelet, History of France, i. 147.
[2] Ibid., i. 108 *et seq.*; Martin, ii. 547.

of France in the Cathedral of Reims, and in the succeeding January his son Robert, a youth of sixteen, and a former pupil of Gerbert, was crowned at Orleans, for the better security of the dynasty. Under the patronage of the new princes, Gerbert was elected to the Archbishopric of Reims, vacant by the degradation of an adherent of the Carlovingians.

We find him united and pledged with the Archbishops of Sens, Tours, and Bruges to defend the rights of their churches against the encroachments of the lay lords, and at the same time to disregard whatever the Pope might do contrary to the determinations of the Fathers. The Pope, as was to be expected, resented such declared opposition, and one of the associated metropolitans seemed disposed to draw back, but Gerbert encouraged him to remember the words of the Lord, "If any say to you, Lo, here is Christ, or Lo, He is there, go not after him." "Some say that at Rome a person is found who can condemn what you think just and justify what you condemn. But I say without hesitation that if the Bishop of Rome himself sins against his brother, and, on being admonished, does not hear the Church, he ought to be regarded as a heathen and publican; and if he separates us from his communion, he cannot separate us from that of Jesus Christ. Let the common law of the Church be the Gospel, with the writings of the apostles and prophets, and the canons established by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the respect of the world, and, finally, those decrees of the Apostolic See which are not contrary to the canons."

But the Pope, pressed by the Carlovingian bishops of Lorraine, despatched a legate into France to deal with the question of the election to Reims, as well as with that of the marriage of King Robert, the heir of the throne of France, with a widow, to one of whose children he was godfather. It is said that the royal family sacrificed Gerbert, and secretly agreed with the Pope that the resignation of Gerbert's predecessor should be declared invalid, while a dispensation should be granted for the marriage. Despairing, therefore, of a favourable issue, Gerbert betook himself to Germany, whither he was urgently invited by the Emperor Otho II. With him he visited Italy. He considered himself too old and infirm to venture on another passage of the Alps, and was appointed Archbishop of Ravenna. In this character he took part in the Council of Rome which annulled the marriage of King Robert. The king resisted and was excommunicated. It is recorded that not only the people but the very lords of the household avoided him, and two servants alone were left to prepare his food. He was forced to yield, and formed another alliance.

At the beginning of 999 Pope Gregory V. died, and Gerbert was his successor under the title of Sylvester II. His pontificate lasted but for four years, but that was long enough to afford him the opportunity of several reforms which afterwards yielded fruit. The prevalent sin of simony received a heavy blow, and the powers of the Papacy were boldly asserted. When we find Sylvester, in a kind epistle to his old competitor Arnulph, declaring that "Peter possesses a

power which no other upon earth equals," it is difficult to identify the opinions of the Pope with those of the same man when Archbishop of Reims.

The most noteworthy utterance, however, of this the first French Pope was that in which he first of all men raised the cry of a crusade. The appeal was couched in the imaginative form of an epistle from the Church of Jerusalem to the Universal Church. "Immaculate spouse of the Lord," it runs, "I am one of thy members, and as I see thee lusty and strong, I have hope to raise up my drooping head. From me the world received its faith and found its Saviour. True, He belongs by His Deity to all parts; but, as man, it was here that He was born, suffered, and was buried. Forward, then, soldier of Jesus Christ, seize thy standard and thy arms. If thou canst not fight, give the succour of thy councils and thy wealth." The despatch of a naval expedition by the republic of Pisa was the only immediate response to the call of the Pope. But the idea sank into the mind of Europe, the more because the Saracens assailed every side of that continent, and the best strategy might well be to attack the enemy in his own regions.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CRUSADES AND THE COMMUNES.

Secular encroachments—Private wars—Truce of God—Hildebrand—Exemption of monasteries from episcopal jurisdiction—Cistercians—Carthusians—Robert of Arbrissel—The Crusades—Ivo of Chartres—Rise of the Communes.

THE year 1000 passed without a catastrophe, and the effect was immense and immediate. A chronicler tells us that in three years after the awful date the churches had been restored through the world. The work of building and decoration gave an impulse to the arts, and a literary and scientific revival followed the æsthetic. The Pope did not forget his early pursuits, and his letters show him busy about copies of classic authors and mathematical works. This latter was the study in which he himself excelled. He introduced from Spain the Arabic numerals, and his work on their use, which he called Abacus, was considered to be magical, until a generation arose which could understand it.

The effects of Gerbert's letter from the Church of Jerusalem, or of the public feeling from which it sprang, continued to increase, and great numbers of every degree took the staff and scrip for the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. A sinister impression prevailed that the Jews despatched unfriendly warnings to the Saracens,

and persecution was raised against this unhappy people both on the part of Church and State. At this time the boundaries between secular and spiritual government became less and less marked. The bishops were feudal barons, and in that character took the infliction of punishment to be their proper duty; and the secular lords shrank not from bringing their power to bear in questions of religion. King Robert despatched the following admonition to the Archbishop of Sens, suspected of unsoundness on the Holy Eucharist: "Thou bearest the name of knowledge, but the light of wisdom shines not in thee: I ask by what audacity it is that, to satisfy thy evil will and thy hatred of the servants of God, thou darest to raise doubts on the Body and Blood of the Lord? Since it is ordained that the priest who distributes the sacrament shall say, 'The Body of Jesus Christ be to thee for salvation of body and soul,' how dost thou not fear to say with bold and polluted lips, Receive, if thou art worthy? Knowest thou not that no one is worthy?" The threats of the king are violent and tyrannical, but it cannot be denied that he shows an intelligent comprehension of the practical question.

A more serious encroachment of the secular power upon the religious sphere took place in the case of certain heretics at Orleans about the year 1022. They were accused of reviving Manicheism and Gnosticism, with all the worst moral effects which those errors had ever produced. Among them were certain clergy of high reputation, one of whom was confessor to Queen Constance. The heresy was said to have been brought

from Italy by a woman; but there remained in France from early times the seeds of strange doctrine, which might well originate such a movement without foreign aid. The secrets of the society were discovered by the agency of pretended converts, and fifteen persons were burnt alive. Here was a miserable change from the time when S. Martin of Tours had protested against the punishment of Prîscillian.

The crying evil in the secular life of France at this period was the prevalence of private wars among the great feudatories. The Crusades put a check upon this evil, and the growth of the kingly power suppressed it; but the Crusades were yet to come, and the time when the king should seek the support of the towns against the feudal lords was still farther in the future. For the present, the Church had to deal with the plague, and she did so by proclaiming the Peace of God. William of Aquitaine seems to have first conceived the idea of inducing the feudal lords to swear before God to keep the peace. King Robert, like his ally King Alfred, adopted the plan.

But even so meritorious a king opposed the attempt to revive the ancient method of election to bishoprics. He considered his own choice a better method of appointment than that of the people and the bishops; and if the king encroached on one side, the Pope encroached more violently on the other. The exemption of monasteries by Papal authority from the jurisdiction of the bishops of the diocese was beginning, though as yet uncommon. French councils might protest against such a privilege in the case of the great house of

Cluny, but the practice became, in a comparatively short space of time, a matter of course.

King Robert died in 1031, having spent his last Lent in a succession of pilgrimages to the relics of saints in many churches. He left the reputation of an ideal Christian king, yet he was tenacious of the power in Church affairs which his predecessors had exercised.

France was desolated in the succeeding reign by a famine, which lasted for three years. Human flesh was not only eaten, but a portion of the population acquired a horrid taste for it. The bishops in council seized the opportunity of urging the observance of the Peace of God. A peace for five years among the nobility was agreed on, and the prelates separated crying, "Peace! peace! peace!" while the cry was taken up by the suffering people. But the restoration of good harvests and plenty soon put an end to the quiet time. Any nobles who attempted to keep the peace, to which the council had bound them, suffered grievous maltreatment at the hands of the less scrupulous. The demand, therefore, upon the part of the bishops was lowered. The Peace of God was henceforth to be the Truce of God, and the truce was to occupy in every week the four days from Wednesday evening to Monday morning.

In so disturbed a country it was necessary that the monasteries should assume a different aspect from the collections of huts which formerly bore the name. Great habitations of monks, strongly built, waxed more and more numerous, till their number almost

equalled that of the stern castles which everywhere frowned upon the poor.

The Abbey of Bec, in Normandy, was among the chief religious houses. It was founded by Herluin, a Norman warrior, who tired of the world at the age of thirty-seven; but the good man found it difficult to discover a house where the life corresponded to the spirit of devotion which absorbed him, and himself built the abbey of Bec, and named it from the little rivulet which ran close by. Herluin had devoted himself to study since the time of his conversion, but it was impossible that he should, at his time of life, become a scholar fit to guide the studies of others. His daily prayer was that God would send him a man more capable of this important duty than he. His prayer obtained for him the help of one of the most powerful minds of the age.

Lanfranc, a famous name in English history, was an Italian by birth, and a hard student from early years. The story of his conversion ran thus: that being in sore peril of his life at the hands of robbers, he could not remember a word of prayer, and this affected him with so much shame that he made a vow of service to God, and inquired of the first peasants he met the way to a religious house. They pointed him to Bec, and his teaching made the school of this monastery one of the most famous in France.

Meanwhile, the Emperor had taken in hand to reform the episcopate in his own kingdom by expelling simoniacal bishops, and extended his regard to the Papacy, which had three rival claimants. They were forced to

resign, and after two Popes of good fame, chosen under the Emperor's influence, had died, his choice fell upon Bruno, Bishop of Toul, who took the name of Leo IX. The newly-elected Pope, on his journey to Rome, visited the Monastery of Cluny. Hildebrand, the prior, had already conceived in his mind the vast design of setting free the Church from lay dominion, and pressed his views upon the Pope with so much vigour that he laid aside the pontifical robes until the choice of the Emperor had been ratified by the clergy and people of Rome. The Pope carried this bold adviser with him to Rome, and created him a cardinal. Leo, from the beginning of his pontificate, declared war against simony. He pursued this object on the soil of France itself by a council held at Reims on occasion of the dedication of the Church of S. Remi. It was not uncommon to meet in the France of that time bishops who considered their sees as fiefs, which were meant to provide for their children, legitimate or illegitimate. The measures which the Pope purposed to take required a strong assertion of his authority, and the first meeting of the council was marked by a solemn declaration that the Pope was the sole head of the Universal Church. Some bishops, who admitted that they had purchased or inherited their places, and some who had not obeyed the Pope's summons to the council, were excommunicated, even though their absence might be due to attendance upon the king. Upon Leo's return to Rome, one of his first cares was to hold a council at which was considered the Eucharistic doctrine of Berengarius, who had Lanfranc for his first opponent; but for this

momentous controversy we must refer our readers to the special treatises upon the history of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

The succeeding Pope, Victor II., was likewise under the influence of Hildebrand, and deputed that great man himself to carry on the reformation of the Church of France. It is said that forty-five bishops and twenty-seven abbots and priors surrendered their ill-gotten preferments. Hildebrand himself is reported on good evidence to have related a story of miraculous aid afforded to his labours. The Archbishop of Embrun, challenged by him to say the *Gloria Patri*, found himself unable to name the Holy Ghost, against whom he had sinned by his simony. A similar story, however, is related of the work of Leo IX., and the fact is explicable by the operation of conscience.

We cannot but sympathise with so righteous a work, and we must admit that none but the Pope could in those times have carried it out. But it implied the claim of powers which primitive customs never gave, and if these powers were applied for the purgation of the sees, they were as capable of being used for more doubtful purposes. For instance, the exemption by Papal power of monasteries from the dominion of their bishop has already called our attention. It continued and increased, and many of the French bishops viewed with jealousy this invasion of their ancient privileges by a foreign power. The Council of Anse declared the privileges granted by the Pope to Cluny to be an abuse, and similar complaints were made in the popedom of Alexander II. by the Bishop of Amiens with

regard to Corbie. But things by that time had advanced, and though the monastery was obliged to yield one of its manors to satisfy the bishop, it maintained its privileges. The Council of Chalons, held under Peter Damien as Papal legate, confirmed the rights of Cluny, and the Bishop of Macon, who had attacked the monastery in arms and excommunicated the brotherhood, was obliged to confess himself wrong. After the council Peter Damien visited Cluny and viewed its splendours, but the incessant occupation of the monks struck him with greater wonder. They had not, he found, more than half-an-hour a day to talk together in the cloister, and it seemed to him they had no time for sin, except perhaps in thought. A large exception; but when we consider the lives which hosts of bishops and clergy were living, we understand well how the Popes were persuaded that in keeping the monasteries under their own jurisdiction they were securing their best instrument of reformation in the Church.

The building of monasteries proceeded apace, and the catalogue of those which rose in the eleventh century is very long. Sometimes they were monuments of penance, as the Abbaye aux Hommes and the Abbaye aux Dames at Caen, which represented the penance imposed on William of Normandy for an uncanonical marriage. The first abbot of the former establishment was Lanfranc, who was replaced at Bec by Anselm, his future successor at Canterbury, a greater thinker but a less successful man of affairs. It would perhaps have been well if Anselm had always remembered the words of the aged Archbishop of

Rouen, to whom he complained of his multiplied employment at Bec: "My dear son, your care for your own salvation must not induce you to put away your responsibilities for that of others. I have known many who, after renouncing work for others in order to occupy themselves with their own perfection, have fallen into indolence, and gone from bad to worse."

The institution of canons regular did not make such rapid progress as the monastic, but it continued to exist. A council at Rome under Alexander II. imposed a common life upon all clergy, but doubtless with little effect. Ivo, afterwards Bishop of Chartres, was the abbot of a foundation of this kind at Beauvais, which flourished greatly and had many offshoots. The eremitic life at this time had become almost extinct in France, and the instances we find of it repel us by their useless self-torture.

On the death of Pope Alexander II., Hildebrand was elected to the office of which he had been so long the spirit. He assumed it with the conscientious determination to cure the two great plagues of the Church—the incontinence of the clergy and the preponderance of secular authority in filling benefices. In the former category he of course included the marriage of priests and bishops, and probably neither public opinion nor conscientious conviction on their own part placed much difference between those who married and those who lived in sin. Very few clergy, we are told, observed continence, especially in Germany and England.

Gregory VII. connected the immoral condition of the

clergy with the preponderance of lay influence in the choice of ecclesiastical dignitaries. What we know of the conduct of his contemporary, Philip I. of France, leads us to sympathise in the Pope's opinion. He had reigned since the age of thirteen, and was still a minor, immoral in life and jealous of his authority. The Pope and this monarch came into immediate collision upon the subject of the appointment of a bishop of Autun. The king yielded in the individual case, but, in spite of promises, continued to traffic in Church dignities; whereupon the Pope addressed a letter to the clergy of France, in which they were commanded to speak freely to their king, and, in case of his disobedience, to lay the kingdom under an interdict. If disobedience should be pushed still further, all the world should know that the Pope would employ the means at his disposal to deprive the culprit of his kingdom. These thunders, however, seem to have produced little effect in France: the threats were exaggerated. But in individual cases the Papal power often sufficed to force an offender to his knees or to protect a bishop who did his duty.

The opposition which the enforcement of celibacy produced was formidable. The Bishop of Cambrai having given notice of exclusion from the choir to married priests, and declared his intention never to ordain their sons, the canons protested, and their words show that clerical marriage, however discouraged, yet prevailed in the age preceding. "We will preserve," said they, "the usages wisely established by the indulgence of our ancestors, and we shall refuse to submit to the new customs which it is designed to introduce."

The Papal legate in France was Hugh of Dié. He was as resolute as his master. Nay, the Pope himself in many cases forgave bishops whom Hugh had suspended or deposed.

Two years after Hildebrand's death the tiara fell to Urban, a Frenchman, and once a monk at Cluny. His pontificate was eventful for France, first of all for the establishment of four new orders of monastic life, two of which were especially great. The Cistercian originated with Robert de Molesme, who, in company with six others, settled at Citeaux, five leagues from Dijon. This famous order was constituted in 1098. The mortification of the life was extraordinary. Of the night hours, only four were given to sleep; four more were spent in devotion. In the morning the monks worked for four hours, and then studied until three in the afternoon, when the office began. Herbs and roots were their whole food.

The Carthusian order falls but little short of the importance of the Cistercian. Its founder was S. Bruno, an accomplished schoolman and teacher in the church of Reims. But Gervais, Archbishop of Reims, died, and had for his successor Manasses, whose life was so scandalous that Bruno accused him at the Council of Autun. Manasses obliged him to resign his offices, and, nothing loth, he embraced the long-sought opportunity of quitting the world. After spending some years under Robert de Molesme, he betook himself, also with six companions, to Grenoble, in order to consult the saintly Bishop Hugh. By his advice they repaired to the desolate region of the Chartreuse,

where a tract was transferred to them by the owners in a deed, the terms of which we still possess. The assignment was made in 1084, and the community commenced their service of hardship in a cluster of cells in which each lived his solitary life, except when they assembled in the church; but from an early period they possessed a valuable library.

The order founded by Robert d'Arbrissel is of the deepest interest to us on account of its philanthropic character. Robert was a popular mission preacher, who was followed about the land by such a crowd of penitents of various sex, age, and condition that he determined to settle and organise them lest scandals should occur; and this he did in a waste place called Fontevraud, on the borders of Anjou and Poitou. Two great monasteries were built, one for men, the other for women, and each had two compartments, that for women containing a nunnery of three hundred, and a house of mercy called La Magdeleine, in which one hundred and twenty penitent females lamented their sins. The male side, in like manner, contained a house for monks, and a hospital for lepers called Saint-Lazare, one of the first of the hospitals which, under the same name, arose in various parts of France. Before long Robert found himself at the head of three thousand religious, and his rules had this characteristic (an instance, perhaps, of the reverence for women which chivalry fostered), that the superiority always belonged to the female community. They represented in the founder's mind the Blessed Virgin, and the males S. John the Evangelist, her faithful guardian and servant. The

Abbess of Fontevraud was the chief of the whole congregation.

In the stir of this extraordinary time the philosophy of the schoolmen began. The Nominalists and Realists fought their wordy contests, into which the world of fashion was drawn with but little understanding of its meaning. But of all the shocks which roused Europe from its torpor, the most important was the crusade. It might well find a place in a history of the French Church, for the French Pope Gerbert originated the idea, and the French Pope Urban II., in his impassioned address at Clermont, brought it to the birth. From France, too, came the largest contingent of the chivalry which took part in the expedition. Franks was the name by which the Crusaders were known in the East. But we must remember the distance of the scene of the crusades from the country which is our subject, and refer our readers to the special historians of those wonderful scenes, in which, if French dash and bravery were eminent, so also were French vanity and insubordination.

But while the French champions were perilling their lives abroad, their king at home was making war on the Cross by his vice. Philip I. was married to Bertha, by whom he had three children, when he met Bertrada, daughter of Simon de Montfort, a woman of great beauty, but already stained with sin. At her persuasion, he dismissed Bertha, and sought a formal divorce in order to marry his favourite. The consent of the bishops was necessary, and in some cases it was easily obtained; but others were less pliable, and among

them Ivo of Chartres distinguished himself by his persistent though fruitless opposition. The king put all his feudal powers in force against the bishop, and theatened the Pope to support the cause of the Anti-Pope if sanction to his adulterous union were refused. His threats were of no avail, and the persistence of Ivo, mingled with wise kindness and concession in minor matters, brought about a separation between the guilty pair; but it lasted only for a short time, and Bertrada was soon in power again, and selling ecclesiastical appointments to the highest bidder.

If Ivo was courageous in resisting the king, he could also correct the Pope, and lay down clearly the difference between investiture with the temporalities or with the fief, and investiture with the episcopal dignity. "With respect," he argued, "to having received from the king's hands investiture with the bishopric, I see not, even if this be true, how this ceremony should injure religion, for no oath is made in it, and canonical election had preceded. Popes have sometimes interceded with kings to obtain bishoprics for those who had been elected. Pope Urban himself, as I understand, only forbade personal vassalage, and not the concession of the temporalities after election. What difference does it make whether this is done by the hand, the mouth, or the pastoral staff, if only the king does not profess to convey anything spiritual?" It seems that some monarchs, especially in Germany, had, in principle, claimed to confer some spiritual gift by the ring and staff; not so in France. What was necessary there was to ensure previous canonical election, in

which the king's power should not be illegitimately exercised, much less purchased by bribery. Ivo's principles displeased the Pope, but a manly reply, in which the good bishop, after all his sacrifices for the Papacy, offered to resign his see, brought the Pontiff to reason.

Under Pascal II. the Papal legates held a solemn council at Poitiers upon the question of the royal divorce. The excommunication of the king was opposed by the Count of Poitiers, who was deeply stained with similar offences. He was supported by many bishops and a crowd of clergy, but in vain. The excommunication was pronounced, and was followed by a popular tumult, in which the bishops were assailed with showers of stones; and it was not till 1103, five years before the close of his lengthened reign, that the king prevailed on himself to separate from his mistress. We may hope that he was penitent, for he desired that he should not be buried at S. Denis on account of the scandal of his life.

The reign of Louis the Fat was conspicuous in the constitutional history of France for the rise of the Communes.[1] The people of the towns, in a large number of cases, effected by purchase or otherwise their deliverance from feudal subjection to the nobles, and recovered the municipal constitutions which were the most precious legacy of the Roman Empire to European freedom; but the struggle was in many cases a severe one. The king naturally favoured the people, but

[1] Michelet's History of France, i. 177; Martin, *Hist. de France*, iii. 129.

money was required to obtain his aid, and in many cases money turned him against them. The part of the Church in these contests cannot be called decisive. Had the bishops been, as of old, the recognised champions of the poor, the communes would have found helpers in every see; but the bishops were now feudal lords, and involved in the complicated machinery of feudal society, and the worldly characters of many prelates, who had attained their places by purchase, were little likely to induce them to favour liberty. Nevertheless, there were cases in which the bishop suffered with the people in their struggle, as well as instances in which he resisted them. Of the latter class was the terrible story of the Norman Bishop of Laon, referendary of Henry I. of England. His influence in the place had been always bad, and the habits both of clergy and laity were lawless. Large sums were drawn from the people by the bishop and other feudal superiors as the price of their commune; the promises made to them were broken, the commune dissolved, and the people taxed for its dissolution. Driven to madness, they besieged the bishop in his palace, discovered him concealed in a cask, and murdered him with every circumstance of fury. On the other hand, Godfrey of Amiens willingly surrendered his seignorial rights for the establishment of a commune, but the lords who possessed similar claims with his refused to follow his example, and desolated the country with fire and sword; upon which those inhabitants who were opposed to the commune accused the bishop of bringing war upon them, and, in despair at the condition of his see, the

good bishop resigned his post, but was compelled by the Council of Soissons to return to it again.

France during the early years of the twelfth century received several Papal visits. Pascal II. received many proofs of devotion during the journey which he made in the country. Gelasius II. died at Cluny, and was succeeded by the Frenchman, Guy, Archbishop of Vienne, who took the name of Calixtus II. This Pope held an important council at Reims, during the course of which he had a meeting with the Emperor, Henry V., at Mouzon, at which the great quarrel of investitures seemed on the point of arrangement. But the Emperor could not determine to surrender, and was excommunicated by the Pope in the council. For this formidable ceremony 427 lighted tapers were distributed to the bishops and abbots present. A canon upon investitures in France was proposed by the Pope to the council. It ran thus: "We absolutely forbid the reception from the hand of a layman of the investiture of churches and other ecclesiastical property." In this form it was resisted by the barons present and by a large number of clergy. The Pope yielded to their objections, and presented it in this amended form: "We absolutely forbid the reception from lay hands of the investiture of bishoprics and abbeys." Thus altered, it was unanimously passed.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE GREAT ABBOTS.

S. Bernard—Peter the Venerable—Suger—The Templars—Innocent II.—Bernard in Italy—Abelard—Crusade of Louis VII.—Albigensian war—Deaths of Suger and Bernard—The Schools—The Cathedrals.

At the Council of Reims the Pope had an interview with Norbert, founder of the Premonstratensian order of canons regular, which in no long time after its foundation comprised a thousand abbeys for men and five hundred for women. But while monasticism had displayed in the lives of the founders whom we have named the utmost sublimity of devotion, and the most thoughtful wisdom in the adaptation of rules to every want, the monk was still to come who should invest the monastic system with the charm of literary genius and supreme personal attraction. This was the work of S. Bernard. The irresistible power of his will and of his love drew his whole family, brothers, uncle, and father, after him into the religious life. No wonder that a saint should lead all the world who led them of his own kin and of his own house. In the Cistercian order they took their vows. That community was stationary in numbers, or even decreasing, when Bernard, with more than thirty companions, sought entrance to it. Almost immediately it acquired vigour,

and began to put forth branches of which the most vigorous was that of Clairvaux, which Bernard himself was selected to lead.

One principle of Bernard's life sets him wide apart from our modern methods, and the most saintly among us will not justify him in the comparison. He set himself deliberately to live the inner life with such intensity that the outer should be wholly suppressed. He aimed at and attained such perfection in this respect, that after having lived a year in his cell he could not say whether it was vaulted or no, or how many were the windows. When, at the urgent request of the monks of the Chartreuse he visited them to deepen in person the fraternal love in Christ which his letters to them expressed by every resource of exquisite style, the good men were surprised to see him arrive upon a richly caparisoned mule. But their offence was turned into admiration when they found that it was his uncle's mule, and that he had journeyed so long upon its back without ever noticing its housings. When Bernard was apparently dying, his dear friend William of Champeaux, Bishop of Chalons, unable to persuade the patient to take care of himself, besought the Chapter of Citeaux to give him absolute authority for a year over their illustrious member; and he used this power so badly as to commit the invalid to a doctor without skill. But Bernard obeyed him without a murmur, and thought it exceedingly good for him who had hitherto had the direction of beings who had reason, to be himself subjected to a creature who had none.

The great Abbey of Cluny, sometime the model of monasticism, had lost its first fervour. The rule was kept, but pride had followed upon success and wealth. The abbot, in visiting the head of another monastery, was followed on one occasion by a hundred baggage-mules. The monks themselves were scandalised by such luxury, and complained to the Pope; and the abbot resigned his position in a fit of pique at the mere fact of a complaint. The monks at the Pope's command proceeded to elect a head. Their first choice died in a few months; but after him they were happy in choosing Pierre Maurice, who, under the title of Peter the Venerable, played a great part in the history of the time. Between this man and Bernard fast friendship subsisted; but it was not maintained upon Bernard's side by any suppression of earnest criticism when he thought it needful. The life of the monks of Cluny seemed to him a great declension from the monastic ideal. Their variety of food, their taste in wines, their precious furs, the size and meretricious decorations of their oratories, and the secular business which the possession of large estates entailed, the abridgment of noviciates, the suppression of fasts, the neglect of manual labour, withdrawal from episcopal jurisdiction, the use of the revenue of parishes without doing the duties, and smaller defections not a few, composed the indictment against Cluny. And though the abbot of the great brotherhood took the admonition in the best part, his reply was weak in many points. But, in spite of these differences, no suspicion ever lay upon Bernard of jealousy on behalf of his own order.

It was his desire to regard all orders as brethren in the cause of God that made him critical of defects as well as eager for affection.

Bernard's first visit to Paris preceded his journey to the Chartreuse. The University of Paris was not yet constituted, but the schools of the city bore the highest reputation. The visitor was requested to deliver an address to the students. He prepared with great care a lecture on subtle points of philosophy which was heard with admiration but failed to move the audience. He perceived his mistake, and on the succeeding day spoke from his heart of the faith, and won several converts to the religious life.

Among the friends whom Bernard influenced was the illustrious Suger, Abbot of S. Denis. This wise counsellor had been brought up in the school of S. Denis with King Louis, and having been employed in the affairs of the state since the beginning of the reign, had secured for himself the highest political education; but the religious life of the monastery was much distracted by the constant access of courtiers and officials, and a taint of secular pride had affected both the statesman and the members of his order. The Apology of Bernard, in which so many sharp reproofs were administered to Cluny, had its effect also at S. Denis, and the observance of the rule was restored without resistance on the part of the community, who saw their abbot lead the way. Bernard's letters to Suger contain a depressing picture of the bishops of the time: "Now men regard only the honour which preferments bring, and not the labour attached to them. We see many

clerks who are ashamed of the lowest rank, and think themselves dishonoured because they have not lofty posts. Children yet at school, and beardless young men, are invested with the highest dignities because they are nobles. Yesterday they were still under the master's rod, and to-day they are in command of priests, happier in having no chastisements to fear than in their dignity, in having escaped their masters than in being masters themselves. That is how they begin, but with time they make progress, and learn quickly how to sell benefices and empty the purses of their vassals. Ambition and avarice are the two able teachers whose lessons they learn." His judgment upon abbots was not less trenchant, and the very Pope himself was not spared when he interfered, as he often did, to make the work of earnest bishops more difficult than it already was. The story of Hildebert of Tours is an instance in point.

Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, though he had, by order of the Pope, been translated from Le Mans, in violation of the ancient rule, yet was an excellent prelate. About a year after his translation he received notice that the deanery and archdeaconry of his diocese had been disposed of by the king, and the royal orders were, to install the persons named. The Archbishop humbly represented that the appointment to ecclesiastical offices did not rest with the king. Louis seized the temporalities of Tours, but, by the interposition of the Papal legate and the king of England, Hildebert obtained justice, and appointed his own dignitaries.

The dean of his choice was a deserving person,

and therefore drew on himself the dislike of some canons of the old school. A certain Nicholas having been especially venomous, the brother of the dean inflicted on him the horrible vengeance of putting out his eyes. Nicholas accused the dean of complicity with the crime, and being unable to obtain a verdict from the courts at Tours, appealed to Rome. Thither the innocent dean was obliged to repair, but was murdered on the way. This was a sample of the difficulties of French bishops at this period, tormented on the one side by the encroachments of the king, and on the other by those of the Popes, who were ever ready to receive appeals, not only of that important character for which canons of some antiquity might be quoted, but of any nature at all, even such as could be far better determined by the local courts. Hildebert accordingly entered his earnest protest on this occasion, and represented that the liberty of appeal to Rome was carried so far as to make the exercise of discipline by the local bishops nugatory; and he received the support of Bernard.

A council was held at Troyes in 1128 by the legate of the Pope, at which Bernard was present by special invitation, and the chief business of the assembly was committed to his hands. It consisted in the task of framing a rule of life and devotion for the order of the Knights-Templars, founded a few years before, but as yet small in numbers.

The rule was contained in seventy-two articles, of which many were added at later dates. Bernard's draft imposed on members attendance both at the day and

night offices, for which, in time of war, the recital of a certain number of paternosters was substituted. Four days of abstinence in the week were to be observed, and Fridays from All Saints to Easter were fasts. The chase was interdicted, but a knight who met a lion should attack and kill it. All intercourse with women was forbidden. This was the rule under which the Templars enlisted in a few years so many warriors of the Cross. A sermon of Bernard gives us a touching picture of the purity of their early years.

At the Council of Etampes Bernard was chosen to determine a more important question still. This assembly was called to decide upon the part which France should take in the dispute between Innocent II. and the Anti-Pope Anacletus. It was the unanimous decision of the assembly, after fasting and prayer, that a matter which concerned the will of God should be referred to God's beloved servant. Bernard probably held the appointment of the head of Christendom at his disposal. In solemn session he raised his single voice, as under the inspiration of the Spirit, and declared Innocent to be the Pope.

He did not stop there, but used all the resources of his eloquence and influence in fighting the battles of the rightful Pontiff. It was he who gained over Henry of England to the cause. It was he who defeated the astute attempt of the Emperor Lothair to gain an advantage in the matter of the investitures as the price of his adherence. He accompanied the Pope into Italy, and devoted some time to visiting the republics of North Italy, the cradles of freedom, but filled with

internal strife and mutual rivalry. The Pope sent his eloquent friend upon a mission of peace to those turbulent communities whose energy and love of liberty made them so worthy of a Christian preacher's work. He had the happiness of reconciling for the time the implacable enmity of Genoa and Pisa. And his letter to the magistrates and people of the former city show us what happy recollections he retained of them. "Faithful people, never shall I forget you. I remained but a short time among you, but I met no obstacles. I sowed and reaped the same day. My harvest was hope for exiles, liberty for slaves, terrors for enemies, confusion for schismatics, the glory of the Church, the joy of the Christian world. My well beloved, what can I do now but exhort you to persevere." In later days, when Bernard had gone to his rest, the city of Genoa placed itself under his patronage. In Pavia, too, he was successful in making peace. But when the bishop thanked him he replied, "In that I can attribute nothing to myself; woe to me if I usurp the glory of Christ. Fair writing is not the work of the pen, but of the hand which guides it."

During this journey Bernard resisted many offers of bishoprics and archbishoprics. His heart was with his monks: "You are my only comfort here below. Wherever I journey, I carry the remembrance of my children; but the sweeter the remembrance, the more bitter is the separation." When he returned, he was welcomed with the news that so great was the daily access of postulants that it was necessary to provide new buildings. The site in the valley of Clairvaux

did not admit of an enlargement of the monastery, and the design proposed was nothing less than a total reconstruction of the edifice in a more roomy situation a little distance off. The proposal was distasteful to the abbot. The old building had cost an immensity of money and labour, and water had been brought in aqueducts with infinite trouble. Men of the world would think them very wasteful to destroy what they had built. No money was in hand for new buildings, and the monks might be in the position of the man who began to build and had not the money to finish. But the brethren replied that God would not send them so many new members if He did not intend to send the means to house them. Bernard's consent was at last given, and money flowed in from all quarters. Bishops in many countries, barons, merchants, were eager to contribute, and required no solicitation. Workmen assembled in large numbers, and the brethren themselves laboured beside them. The vast establishment seemed to grow as if it were a thing endowed with life; and we rejoice to read that water was introduced into every cell.

The Papal schism was still alive in Aquitaine, where Gerard of Angouleme, a disappointed man of ability, supported the cause of Anacletus. Bernard made a journey through the country with the usual effect. None could resist his eloquence and zeal; but on one point the powerful Count of Poitiers was inflexible. He could not restore the bishops he had deprived; he had made an oath never to do so. The scene in which his determination gave way is a vivid picture of religion

in the Middle Ages. Bernard celebrated Mass; the Count, being under excommunication, was in the porch.

When the consecration was effected, and the pax had been transmitted by the deacon to the people, the servant of God, acting by a divine impulse, placed the Body of the Lord on a paten, and, with face on fire and eyes flashing, he walked to the porch of the church. He did not supplicate, as in the previous conference: his air was threatening. When he came to the Count he addressed him thus: "We have besought thee, and thou hast despised us. Already in another conference a band of God's servants addressed their prayers to thee, and thou regardedst them not. Now it is the Virgin's Son, the Chief and Master of this church which thou persecutest, that cometh to thee. There is thy Judge, the Judge of heaven, earth, and hell, before whom all bend the knee. There is the Judge into whose hands thou wilt one day fall. Wilt thou dare to despise Him too, and treat Him as thou hast treated His servants?" The Count, thunderstruck by this address, fell back. He foamed at the mouth, he worked like an epileptic, and then lay cold and lifeless as a corpse. Bernard pushed him with his foot, and bid him rise and listen to the judgment of God, namely, to restore the deposed Bishop of Poitiers, to bring back all the schismatics that he could, and submit to the Pope. The Count could not utter a word, but ran to the bishop, embraced him, and placed him in his episcopal seat.

Bernard would not have been human if so much deference and so much success in the mastery of men

had not made him sometimes self-confident. We cannot admire his part in the sad story of Abelard. Abelard was an intellectual giant, not, indeed, superior to his time, but able to use the intellectual weapons which it placed at his disposal with irresistible power and skill. He had not Bernard's depth of religious feeling nor his power of sympathy, and he shows beside the saint like a modern man of science in comparison to a master in the spiritual life.[1] But Abelard was treated in his intellectual contests with as cruel injustice as in his personal relations. Bernard should not have judged him by extracts from his works, should not have condemned him without hearing his arguments, and should not have used his influence with the Pope to procure his condemnation, without the most complete investigation of his theology. In this piteous history Peter the Venerable played a more attractive part than his brother abbot, for he received the stricken man into his monastery with hospitality and kindness, gave him the consolations of friendship and a life of study, with opportunities of teaching; comforted the poor faithful widow who mourned for him, and watched over his son as a faithful guardian.[2]

The different treatment which they meeted to Abe-

[1] M. Remusat (*Abélard*, vol. ii. p. 164) remarks that the disputes on transubstantiation gave the impulse to the introduction of the dialectic spirit into theology; then Anselm, William of Champeau, and other masters, strove each in his way to cast theology into a more scientific form. Of William it was said that he first rendered theology contentious. But none shone in the schools so much as Abelard. He came with entire sincerity to the task of fashioning the faith into a dialectic form, for the purpose of defending it against dialectics. This was the keynote of scholasticism.

[2] Michelet, Hist. of France, i. 83; Martin, iii. 324, 332, v. 461.

lard caused no breach in the friendship of Peter the Venerable and Bernard. On the contrary, the abbot of Cluny mediated between the antagonists, and Bernard declared himself willing to forgive the man whom he had so deeply injured. But the two abbots came into more direct conflict upon the appointment of a Bishop of Langres. The clerk canonically elected and consecrated was a monk of Cluny, and Peter took his part; but Bernard made unsparing use of the credit which he had acquired at Rome by his exertions in the cause of the Pope. The rightful bishop was displaced. The principles of canonical election, for which the best bishops in France contended, were trodden under foot by Papal authority. A gross job was perpetrated. But other instances besides that of Bernard have been found in which pious persons have regarded their particular jobs as acts of righteousness, which none but the wicked could oppose.

The Papal authority again appears as the source of trouble to the French Church in the case of Bourges, where a clerk, disliked by the king, was elected by a portion of the clergy, and consecrated by the Pope at Rome without communication with the court of France. The king was the youthful Louis VII., and Pope Honorius was injudicious enough to say that he wished to give the young man a lesson. The king forbade the new prelate to touch the temporalities of the see; the Pope replied by laying the king's domains under an interdict. The quarrel was complicated by another question of divorce; for the king, when repairing to Guienne to marry Eleanor, the heiress of Aquitaine and

Poitou, brought with him the Count of Vermandois, who fell in love with Alix, the sister of Eleanor, and procuring, as usual, a divorce from his wife at the hands of interested prelates, proceeded to marry his new favourite.

The Count of Champagne, uncle to the insulted wife, solicited from the legate the excommunication of the Count of Vermandois, and increased that offence to the king by giving an asylum to the expelled Archbishop of Bourges. The king invaded Champagne, and wasted it with fire and sword, and the kingdom found itself severed into two parties on these miserable questions, one of them holding with the Pope, and the other with the king. Bernard, as one would expect, espoused the Papal side, but Suger, though the war and its cruelties must have gone to his heart, was not prepared to sacrifice the royal rights because the Pope wished to teach the young king a lesson. Bernard did not comprehend the far-sighted policy of peace and order which Suger forwarded by strengthening the royal power and depressing the great vassals; but the Count of Champagne was hardly dealt with, we must allow, when the king imposed on him, as the price of peace, an oath that he would obtain from the Pope a withdrawal of the excommunication. That oath, however, was demanded, and was taken, and because the Count found himself unable to keep it, the king again invaded Champagne, massacred the whole population of Vitry, and burnt three thousand fugitives in a church. It is some comfort that the king heard from Bernard the truth about God's judgment upon such acts, uttered with as

burning a sympathy for the cause of the poor as any modern democrat could have expressed.

Bernard's attempts to mediate between the king and his vassal were not successful, and he knew it. It was at the court of Rome, under Cœlestine II., a friend of Peter the Venerable and pupil of Abelard, that the affairs of France were settled. The slain people were forgotten, and the reconciliation of the monarch and his vassal was so complete that at a later period, upon the dissolution of the marriage of Louis with Eleanor of Aquitaine, the king married the daughter of the Count. Eleanor carried her vast inheritance with her to Henry II. of England; a great disaster for France.

As if the two great abbots of France were alternately to influence the election of a Pope, Cœlestine was succeeded at a brief interval by Eugenius III., a Cistercian monk and disciple of S. Bernard. The wretched condition of the Eastern Christians called for a new crusade, and Bernard was intrusted by the Pope with the charge of moving France to espouse the cause. This was an injunction after the saint's own heart, and such as none could execute so well. An eye-witness gives us the picture of his appearance at the great assembly of Vezelay: "This venerable man is pale and half dead through his fasts and austerities; he carries on his countenance such evident marks of humility, repentance, and mortification, and everything in his person attests such perfect sanctity, that one is persuaded almost before he opens his mouth to speak."

Accordingly, he had scarce begun to speak when cries of "The cross! the cross!" resounded. He

threw into the crowd a great quantity which had been prepared, but still the cry was raised, and he tore his cloak in pieces to make a supply of the sacred sign; the king cast himself at the feet of the saint and received the mark of devotion from his hands. And the leaders of the crusade took the determination to make the holy man their general. He refused this insane appointment, but traversed both France and Germany enlisting soldiers of the cause, and a scene of almost equal enthusiasm to that of Vezelay was enacted at Spires, when, after Mass, he addressed the Emperor Conrad, "not as a king, but as a man," and constrained him to receive the cross and the sacred banner.

Even during the enlistment of the sacred army the crusading excitement drew with it great cruelty to the unhappy Jews. One is thankful to know that Bernard was clear of any complicity with this crime. "Does not the Church," he wrote, "triumph much more gloriously over the Jews by enlightening, convincing, and converting them, than by cruelly massacring them? Is it, then, without reason that from East to West the Church addresses her prayers to God for the Jews, faithless though they be, and beseeches Him to take from their hearts the veil which hides the light from them?"

Bernard was present at the great Parliament of Etampes in the February of 1147, and took a leading part in the happy choice there made of a regent of the kingdom during the absence of the King. It was upon Suger that the appointment fell, and the superhuman powers of work and rule which that great man

put forth were the one compensation for the disasters of the crusade. To supply the never-ceasing demands of money for the campaign without oppressing the people, to keep order among the vassals during the absence of the suzerain, together with all the ordinary calls of the administration of a great kingdom, would have far overtaxed the ability and prestige of any secular lord of the time. But Suger accomplished it all, though at the sacrifice of his own health and of the resources of his great monastery. The enterprise which commenced with such enthusiasm caused the destruction of two mighty armies with no success to show for them. France saw her king return with a few hundred knights, alienated from his wife, whose misconduct had been the scandal of the army. But all this was no fault of Suger. It was Bernard who felt that blame might be laid to his charge for having so vehemently urged the expedition, and he accounted for its failure as a just judgment of God upon the sins of those who took part in it.

While Suger was governing and the crusading army was perishing, the ceaseless activity of Bernard was busied upon theological contests. The first was with Gilbert de la Porée, Bishop of Poitiers. The subjects of dispute were very recondite, and concerned the nature of God, between which and the attributes of God Gilbert drew such a distinction as to deny that the Divine nature was incarnate. These subtleties deeply offended Bernard, who wished that he had a pen of iron to write upon flint or diamond that God's essence, nature, form, divinity, goodness, wisdom,

virtue, power, grandeur, and all His attributes, are God. And Bernard spoke rightly and according to Scripture. But when we take Bernard's side in this controversy, we ought to admit that the same reasoning shows the impossibility of distinguishing substance and accident in the definition of the Real Presence. Gilbert's error was due to that very metaphysical system which had its way shortly afterwards in the doctrine of transubstantiation. The impossibility of separating God and His attributes does not depend upon any qualities of His infinity, but upon the laws of our thought; and that which is true of our conception of Him is true also of our conception of matter. If we may not say that attributes may change yet the God beneath them be the same, neither can we say that accidents may be the same yet the substance beneath them be different.

Bishop Gilbert made the necessary retractations at the Council of Reims with a facility which no politician could surpass. "If you believe otherwise," he professed, "I shall believe otherwise; if you speak otherwise, I shall speak otherwise; if you write otherwise, I shall write otherwise." But the same council had to do with heretics more obstinate than Gilbert, and its decree against them was of a more awful character than he had to face. "As it is the custom of the Apostolic See carefully to defend justice and shun lawlessness, we forbid by the present decree all persons to receive or protect the heretics of Gascony and Provence. If any one shall receive them into his house or entertain them on their journeys, let him be smitten

with the anathemas wherewith God smites souls in His wrath, and let not the divine offices be celebrated in his territory till he have made fitting satisfaction."

For many years the southern provinces of France had been the scene of fanatical movements, the leaders of which were Peter de Bruys and a certain Henry, who had already disturbed the peace of the Church in other parts; but how far the notions which fermented in that southern land, the home of passion, pleasure, and impulse, were due to individual preachers, or were the natural errors of a population which never had been brought to a spiritual faith, we cannot tell. Pope Eugenius sent among them his legate, Alberic, Bishop of Ostia, Geoffrey of Chartres, and S. Bernard. The legate was but ill received, but when Bernard, in his irresistible tones, addressed a vast crowd, and commanded them to raise the right hand in token that they were Catholics, the hands went up at once.

The doctrine of Peter and Henry seems to have been a revival of Manicheism in its fleshly form.[1] They are said to have had a special enmity to the Cross, and Peter, in one of his preaching tours in Languedoc, pulled down and publicly burnt all the crosses that he could find; but the wretch himself was cast into the same fire. Peter the Venerable, on a journey through Provence, encountered many of the sectaries, and composed a work to aid the bishops in their arguments. He praises the prelates for working by persuasion—would they had continued to deserve his praise!—and he reduces the tenets of the heretics to five points—

[1] Michelet, Hist. of France, i. 212 *et seq.*

1. Condemnation of infant baptism. 2. Churches are useless, for God is everywhere. 3. Crosses are to be destroyed, as recalling the punishment of the Lord. 4. His Body and Blood are not in the Eucharist. 5. No prayers for the dead.

The sectaries had their branches in the north, where a severe life is ascribed to them, including strict vegetarianism; but their severity did not extend to the relations of the sexes. Some among them abjured the sacraments as illusory, on account of the imperfections of the priesthood, and rejected the intercession of the saints, with purgatory and corporal penances, on the ground that contrition of the heart sufficed. Many of these tenets bore a certain resemblance to phases of the Reformation, and this has sufficed to induce the uncritical on one side to claim the Albigenses as brethren, and on the other to saddle Protestantism with all the excesses into which these unhappy heretics were betrayed.[1]

Within little more than two years the Church of France lost her two great abbots, Suger and Bernard, the one in 1151, the other in 1153. Suger, strange to say, was contemplating a crusade at the age of seventy. He had been opposed to that which had actually taken place because it withdrew the king from France; but he was not for allowing the enterprise to be a failure when once it had begun. He believed that the design could be executed by good management. The revenues of his magnificent abbey supplied funds even for so large a purpose, and he might well think that the man who

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 9 *et seq.*

had managed the affairs of a kingdom could conduct a crusade; but a slow fever put an end to his mighty projects.

S. Bernard mingled with activity to the very last in every great affair. A consideration addressed to Eugenius III. shows that, while he was biassed for the Papal side, he was neither unwilling to give the king his just right of investiture after election, nor yet unconscious what vast reforms the Papacy required in order to perform the sanctifying work for which he looked to it. He would have had the Pope divest himself of temporal cares, discourage needless appeals, abase the pride and avarice of Roman ecclesiastics and officers, and abandon the practice of exempting abbots from their bishops, bishops from archbishops, archbishops from primates. Under this abominable plague the churches generally complained that they were mutilated, and the saint did not believe that the Pope has permission from God thus to disturb the order of His Church.

It is well known that Bernard was opposed to the establishment of the festival of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and therefore to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which underlies that observance.[1] He was willing, nay, eager to recognise her as exempt from actual sin, but he cannot see it just to argue that, because her birth was holy, so was her con-

[1] "The Virgin took possession of almost all the temples and altars, piety was converted into chivalrous gallantry, the Mother of God was proclaimed to be pure and spotless, and the mystic Church of Lyons celebrated the festival of the Immaculate Conception." — *Michelet, History of France*, i. 185.

ception. "Whence could the conception have received this sanctity? Can any one make me understand that the Blessed Virgin could be sanctified before she existed? and did she exist before her conception?"

In the hands of such men as Suger and Bernard the position of the abbots of the twelfth century, and of the monasteries which they commanded, was indeed great, but learning was no longer their exclusive possession. The great teachers of the time were not monks, as they had been in the age before. It was in the episcopal schools, especially those of Chartres and Paris, and that of the canons regular of S. Victor, also in the capital, that the illustrious scholastics of the time delivered their lectures and trained their students. Hugh and Richard of S. Victor had great fame, but the episcopal school of Paris, where the traditions of Abelard were still followed, produced the man whose work furnished the text of scholastic exercise until Thomas Aquinas surpassed it. This was Peter Lombard, called, from his great work, the Master of the Sentences, who, after lecturing for many years, was raised to the see of Paris. The boast of Chartres was John of Salisbury, who was by no means a dry scholastic. His chief work was a satire upon the vices of the feudal nobles, their hunting, their game-laws, their magic, and the other vain pursuits that filled their lives; after which the author describes the serious pursuits which should take the place of vicious trifling; among these the study of the philosophies of antiquity. John records a conversation in which Adrian IV. desired him to say what he thought of the Pope and of

the Roman court. The reply does not err on the side of flattery. "Avarice and hypocrisy are the source and origin of all the evils of the Roman Church."

The monuments of mental activity which the schools of the twelfth century bequeathed are buried in the dust of libraries and forgotten; the great cathedrals form a visible record to attest the grasp of mind, the perseverance, the religious elevation, and the sense of beauty which existed amidst all the defects of this extraordinary time. The latter part of the twelfth century was the opening of the great period of French architecture, and to it belong the commencements of such exquisite creations as the cathedrals of Le Mans, Strasbourg, Bayeux, Rouen, Coutances, and multitudes of others. The Abbot Suger found time amidst all his avocations to rebuild his abbey church of S. Denis with great magnificence, although the next generation found his work too heavy, and replaced it by the lovely building which still exists. The great church of Nôtre Dame in Paris, better known perhaps than any other in the world, was designed and carried far forward in the end of the twelfth century by Maurice de Sully, Bishop of Paris. In the latter case, some of the cost was raised by selling indulgences, and the bishop is said to have consulted pious friends upon his adoption of this expedient, and received the frank reply that it would be far better for the faithful to be left to carry out their prescribed penances uncommuted.

Such indefensible sacrifices of spiritual benefits to material occasions, and the bargain by which sins were supposed to be remitted in exchange for church works,

cast a shade upon some of the methods by which these fair buildings were constructed. But we hear of better signs of faith and devotion to the work; of crowds of gentry helping to draw the timber and the stones, of associations for great religious labours, into which none but devout persons were received, of artisans offering their services without reward. The master-masons, under whom the work was carried on, were true artists, but their names are lost, and so are those of the designers of the noble plans and elevations, except in a chance instance like that of Amiens, due, as we know, to Robert de Luzarches, or the Sainte-Chapelle, to Pierre de Montereau. The ingenious and beautiful minds to which these imaginations were due belonged to unknown clerks, or monks, or working-men, who have left us only these productions of their genius, that we may learn not to despise a past which here, at least, far excels the present.

CHAPTER IX.

THE MENDICANTS.

The Crusade in Languedoc—The Inquisition—Order of S. Dominic—The Church and the Communes—The University and the Friars—Pragmatic Sanction—The Clergy against the Mendicants—Popes at Avignon—Fall of the Templars.

IT has suited the purposes of party writers, both among the friends and enemies of the victims of the Albigensian crusade, to confound them in one mass. But the Waldenses and the Albigenses had nothing in common except the fate which they shared at the hands of the Church. The Albigenses were undoubtedly tinged with Manicheism,[1] but the Waldenses, or poor men of Lyons, belonged to one of those earnest ultra-spiritual sects which have so constantly risen at periods when the Church was lax in duty and splendid in ceremonial. While the heretics overspread the country with their preaching, the prelates and clergy of the Church were sunk in inefficiency. It was known to the Pope and his counsellors that the lives of the clergy were the great cause of heresy. But the efforts made to amend this fault, and to send a better gospel to those who were in error, were fitful and ineffectual. The church of the time incurred the horrible guilt of

[1] See Schmidt, *Histoire des Cathares ou Albigeois*, Paris, 1849, pp. 3, 25, 33.

neglecting to instruct her children and then massacring them because they did not know her lessons. The blame cannot be laid upon the secular princes, for the Church aroused, encouraged, and rewarded them for their bloody work. The third Council of the Lateran, assembled under Alexander III., and including sixty-one French bishops, decreed that although the Church, according to S. Leo, rejects blood-shedding, yet she may be helped by the laws of princes ;[1] the fear of corporal punishment may sometimes produce the desire for the spiritual remedy." When corporal punishment is carried to the length of slaying tens of thousands and depopulating whole provinces, it is cynical to represent it as subsidiary to spiritual remedies. Moreover, all obligations, feudal or otherwise, to heretical lords were dissolved. Those who died in war against the heretics were promised eternal life if truly repentant ; and all who should take arms in the campaign were offered two years' remission of penance, with liberty to the bishops to increase the favour in proportion to the fatigues undergone. The soldiers of the Church were covered with her protection, like those who visited the Holy Sepulchre.

The third and fourth crusades in the Holy Land put off for a few years the inevitable assault upon the Albigenses. The first of these two expeditions was that in which Philip Augustus of France and our own King Richard took share. The French king played a part in it more able than chivalrous, and his efforts to

[1] Even S. Thomas Aquinas considers that heretics not only deserve to be separated from the Church, but to be cut off from the world by death. Martin, iv. 285.

aggrandise his crown at the expense of the English were continued into the reign of King John, from whom he wrested Normandy and reunited it to his kingdom.

The third crusade was in truth the last which deserved the name. The fourth turned from the Holy Land to the capture of Constantinople. It was the work chiefly of Frenchmen. If the empire then established had received support from the West, it might have been the means of barring Turkish conquest. Some such aim was in the mind of Pope Innocent III., but he could not induce the monarchs of that date to contemplate an object so distant.

The Pope was far more successful in an object which was mischievous. From the time when the third Lateran Council had proclaimed indulgences for the Albigensian war, the contest had opened. Little encouragement was required for a work of fanaticism and cruelty. No more terrible degradation of religion was ever made than that of promising its rewards for such a service; and though the crusades had been lowered from their ideal by many miserable infirmities, yet even the name crusade was vulgarised in application to such a war as this. But it was a catching title, for it presented all the religious glories of the soldier of the Cross, together with satisfaction of the bloodthirsty instincts which lay concealed under his religion, to be gained by service in his own country, at comparatively little cost of danger, privation, or travel.[1]

[1] To be sure, the remark of Michelet is true, that "the martyrs of the Middle Ages seldom display the meekness of the martyrs of primitive times, who knew how to die only;" whereas the Albigenses and the Protestants ever fought on. Hist. of France, i. 227.

The claim of Pope Innocent to feudal suzerainty over all European countries furnished another element of virulence to the Albigensian war; for as provinces were conquered in that golden land, the Papal legates, even though the Pope shrank from the act, assigned them in feudal possession to the leaders of the army. Thus, after every man, woman, and child in Beziers had been destroyed, in execution of a threat of the Abbot of Citeaux, the domains of the Viscount were assigned by the legates to Simon de Montfort; nay, the vast dominions of the Count of Toulouse himself were made over in the same fashion to the same warrior, who sank from a dauntless fanatic to a selfish usurper, possessed of resources to keep the land in misery, without enough to pacify and rule it. The ancient enmities of Franks and Gallo-Romans were revived and fostered. The young Count of Toulouse, encouraged, it seems, by Innocent himself,[1] never lost his hold upon his father's inheritance; but the whole came finally to the Crown.[2]

In these grievous times S. Dominic founded his great preaching order. It was a noble attempt to supply by devotion and spiritual power that entire absence of genuine clerical work in the country which had led to such deplorable results. Its importance to the Church at large and to the Papacy cannot be over-rated, but it

[1] Upon the misgivings of Innocent III. as to the war in Languedoc, see Michelet, Hist. of France, i. 239 *et seq.* Perhaps it was this taint of blood which consigned Innocent, according to the legend, to the tortures of Purgatory until the judgment-day; but this reason is not assigned. Louvet, *Le Purgatoire*, Paris, 1880, p. 130.

[2] Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 151.

was all too late to save the Albigenses. S. Dominic himself was present in some bloody scenes of the war; but the chief reason for reproaching him or his order with the Albigensian crusade lies in the fact that the work of the Inquisition was committed to the Dominicans. The Inquisition arose out of the parochial machinery of the Church, which was established for spiritual purposes, but was misapplied in these times to fanaticism and tyranny. It borrowed from the Church its indifference to the strict forms of earthly law, and from the State its indifference to human pain and to the claims of human freedom; and thus, by selecting what was worst out of each department, it produced a judicial system which has attracted singular detestation among men. France, amidst all its violences, never had a national Inquisition.[1]

It is a relief to turn from these cruel subjects to the progress of learning. To the age of which we have been treating belongs that union of the various schools of Paris which is called the University. A diploma, granted by Philip Augustus in A.D. 1200, is regarded as its definite act of constitution. The cognisance of crimes committed by the students was taken from secular tribunals and committed to ecclesiastical, and the Provost of Paris was, upon his entrance to office, to take an oath to observe this rule. In A.D. 1215 Cardinal Robert de Courçon, legate of Pope Innocent III., laid down regulations for the age and qualification

[1] Upon the hatred entertained for the Inquisition, and the natural effect which it had in protracting the Albigensian heresy, see Schmidt, *Les Cathares*, p. 301.

of teachers, and for the subjects of study; and great effects might have resulted for the intellectual fortunes of Europe and the East if the Pope's design of making Paris the training college of priests for the Greek Empire had been carried out.[1]

The reign of S. Louis would be a fair period indeed in the history of the Church of France if we could confine our regard to the character of the king and the progress of learning and art, without remembering the persecution of heretics and the wars of clerical ambition. Blanche of Castile, the mother of the king, had taught him that she had rather see him dead than that he should commit a mortal sin, and her sincere piety and his were often independent of clerical influences. The prodigality with which excommunications were scattered by the clergy had brought familiarity and contempt. The Southern heretics viewed Church censures with disregard, and their temper had its effect on the age. The King was on good terms with the communes, and they well understood that their best help against bishops as well as barons was to be hoped from him.

Both the king and his mother were skilful politicians, and careful for the growth of the monarchy. The Treaty of Paris, by which Count Raymond of Toulouse was admitted to peace, was all for the advantage of the Crown, since by one of the articles the daughter of Raymond was to marry the brother of the king, and bring her father's inheritance into the royal house.

[1] To the same period belongs the institution of the Parliament. This title belongs, in France, to the Supreme Court of the king in a province. The chief was that of Paris. Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 294.

But the pacification was immediately followed by a royal decree upon the liberty of the Church—a sad misnomer indeed, for it was a persecuting edict, putting the civil power at the disposal of the bishop to punish immediately those whom he might condemn, and depriving those who should favour or receive heretics of all civil rights. The power of the Keys being despised in the country, those who are excommunicated are to be "compelled by temporal punishments" to return to the unity of the Church. But when Louis grew in years and wisdom, he found himself obliged to modify the latter ordinance, and confine it to those whose excommunication was just.

The communes profited by the shortcomings and contentions of their superiors to secure their own privileges. In Reims the citizens beleagured the vassals of the Archbishop in the castle, tearing up the pavements of the streets and the tombstones of the cemetery to aid the siege. The king was summoned to aid the Archbishop, but interposed delay. The bishops of the province and delegates of the chapters met and gave the king the three canonical warnings to do his duty, but to no purpose. They met again to determine on the means of compelling him. The assembly was divided between a nominal punishment and an interdict upon the royal domains of the province; but the nobles of the province met at S. Denis and addressed the Pope in a collective letter requesting his interference to repel the attacks of the clergy against their feudal rights. The Pope replied ineffectively by a large body of extracts from imperial edicts and Papal

bulls; but the king took the matter in hand, and appointed arbitrators, and when the death of the Archbishop left the see vacant for some years, the commune obtained fair terms from the chapter.

The war in Languedoc degenerated into a contest between barons of the North and of the South. Religious interests fell into the hands of the Inquisition, which grew apace, and received form in the Council of Toulouse, which determined that the prelates should establish in all parishes of town and country a tribunal composed of a priest and two or three laymen of repute, who should bind themselves by oath to search for heretics "diligently, faithfully, and frequently;" and among the heretical practices most strictly forbidden was the reading of the Bible. "We forbid the faithful to possess the books of the Old or New Testament, except the Psalter or Breviary for the divine offices or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary. We forbid them expressly to possess even these books in the vulgar tongue."

The rule established by the central tribunal at Toulouse, that the names of the witnesses should be kept secret from the accused, was vehemently complained of, and so much popular sympathy was shown, that the Papal legate was obliged to fly the place. He directed, however, the Bishop of Toulouse to formulate the rules of procedure, and, with the assent of Count Raymond, most unwillingly given, tribunals of the Inquisition were established throughout Languedoc under the sanction of Pope Gregory IX., who appointed the judges from the Dominicans. Thus the system of delation, the worst

reproach of the heathen reign of Tiberius, was adopted into the methods of the Christian Church. The popular cry against the Dominicans was soon so hot that Franciscans were associated with them in the charge.

The Dominicans boast a better record than this in the learning which some of their members possessed. When a dispute arose between the University of Paris and the Court, so fierce that the professors abandoned their duties, the Dominicans offered to take up the work. Their reputation was so well recognised that the University found it prudent to accept the mediation of the Pope and return to business.

The thirteenth century, though its intellectual glories are somewhat hidden from us by the splendours of the Renaissance, was yet a period of revival and progress, hardly less wonderful than that illustrious time. It was the very zenith of art in many kinds; the Sainte-Chapelle of Paris was but the most exquisite gem which this grand period produced. It was built by S. Louis as a shrine for the Crown of Thorns, presented to him by Baldwin, Emperor of Constantinople. Our credulity is not equal to the burden of accepting the genuineness of the relic, but our Christian sympathy is weak indeed if we are not affected by reading of the joy and devotion with which the precious memorial was received by the king and his court, and by the tears which they shed at feeling Christ so near to them.

Pope Innocent IV. was forced to leave Italy through fear of the Emperor Frederick II., and demanded an asylum in France. The king received him with the utmost

respect at the Abbey of Citeaux, but would only promise an asylum on condition of the assent of his barons, which was not given. There was much sympathy with Frederick in France, and strict neutrality was observed. Aragon and England were equally unwilling, and the Pontiff retired to the city of Lyons, where the power of its Archbishop enabled him to feel secure. But the Papal Court was ever in want of money; the immense expenses which its ambition entailed were never provided for by its stated revenue, and its resources in a foreign land were far smaller than at home. Many wealthy prelates and abbots came to its aid, but they were compensated by appointments and promises, and the nobles found their dislike of the clergy appeased by the restriction of the highest ecclesiastical appointments to their own order. The reign of favour and corruption in France was sensibly encouraged by the presence of the Pope within its borders.

The Crusade of S. Louis,[1] vowed in sickness, and carried out in the highest spirit of Christian chivalry, was a disaster for his kingdom. It was begun against the advice of his pious mother, but she ruled in his absence. Among the troubles which she had to face was the movement of the Pastoureaux,[2] which began as a crusade of simple peasants to deliver the king, and grew into a vast tumult of vagabonds and discontented people, proclaiming as they went the vices of the mendicants, the monks, the clergy, but above all the Court of

[1] Michelet attributes the Crusade to S. Louis's uneasiness of conscience concerning the ill-won inheritance of Languedoc. History of France, i. 248.

[2] Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 245.

Rome. The inevitable collision with the forces of society occurred at Orleans, and the united enmity of the Church, the knights, and the populace gradually exterminated the revolters. But Queen Blanche was a true friend to the people, and exerted herself to free the serfs, who, in parts of France, were still bought and sold with the land. On one occasion she set free certain slaves from the prison of the canons of Nôtre Dame of Paris; but in this case she proved to have exceeded her powers, and was condemned by an ecclesiastical court to pay an indemnity to the canons. One of the judges who delivered this sentence, in obedience to the law, was the Bishop of Paris, who shared the good queen's desire to see slavery abolished, and freed the serfs of his see. Freedom was conditioned by the obligation to feudal dues, which made heavy deductions from the boon; on the other hand, the liberated man and his descendants were able to enter the clerical order, a promising road to honour and advantage, for the outward condition of the clergy was widely and largely improved.

The literary activity of the age was immense, and the establishment of the mendicant orders, instead of being, as might be imagined, a step backwards into intellectual darkness, had the reverse effect. It formed a new era in preaching, and introduced the idea of making sermons intelligible to the people at large. An overwhelming proportion of the popular preachers of the time belonged to the Dominician order, and the Franciscans followed. Their example roused the secular clergy. To this period belongs the career of

Jacques de Vitry in France, Italy, and the Holy Land. His "Exempla," or repertory of anecdote for pulpit use, has lately been published by our Folk-Lore Society—a rich treasury. But the work of the mendicant orders in the higher walks of education and literature was not less remarkable than their diffusion of popular knowledge. The names of Albertus Magnus and S. Thomas Aquinas are the just pride of the Dominicans, and S. Bonaventura of the Franciscans. It would be hard to name in the history of mind three lives of more stupendous labour, or more purely devoted to the pursuit of truth. Truth was followed, indeed, upon conditions and assumptions not now accepted by the thinking world; but the chains were not so tight as to deprive those who wore them of mental activity, courage, or devotion. But time in our busy age is wanting for the study of these voluminous authors. The works of Albert comprise twenty-one vast folios, and even in these are not complete. To him the unrestricted study of Aristotle was due; and he carried this intellectual triumph in spite of the prepossession, and even the formal discouragement, of the highest authorities of the Church. The other members of the great trio were not so voluminous as Albert; but the most prolific of modern novelists has not filled so many pages with easy writing as these great workers with tough thought. The "Summa" of S. Thomas was for centuries the ruling authority of the most active and accomplished minds of their time, while S. Bonaventura held a position scarcely lower in the world of feeling and devotion. To have been

the object of the adoring homage of a Dante is such an immortality as writers will never more attain.

None of these thinkers belonged to France by birth, but whatever was best and most capable in teaching power gravitated to the intellectual capital of the world. The three just named gave many of their best years to the Church of France. It was not, however, without a severe struggle that even these made their footing good against the jealousy of the University of Paris. The right of their orders to teach, the number of their teachers, the value of their degrees, were all contested, step by step, with the obstinacy which institutions regarding themselves as the guardians of sound learning have ever displayed. An effort of Robert de Sorbon, a stout supporter of the University, to form an offshoot of that institution in a quarter where the friars were busy, formed the commencement of the great theological school of the Sorbonne.[1]

The University had more than once been in conflict with the civil power. It was too possible that the right of a mass of students in a great city to be judged by ecclesiastical law, and not by that of the land, would again produce collision. The University, therefore, jealous of its independence, required from all teachers in union with it an oath of obedience to its statutes, and a promise to cease teaching if the University for any reason should suspend its lectures. These trades-union pledges the mendicants refused. Literary quarrels aggravated the dispute. A certain book called the "Eternal Gospel," attributed to the

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 265 *et seq.*

General of the Franciscans, began to be expounded by the friars in Paris. It contained serious errors, prophesying a coming reign of the Spirit which was to excel the dispensation of the Son, and in which the mendicant orders were to hold the place of apostles. On the other side, a book on the perils of the last times was produced by William de Saint-Amour, in which not only the educational offences of the mendicants were freely treated, but the whole principle of their order was assailed, and the licenses and exemptions conferred upon them by the Pope were pronounced contrary to the law of the Church. It was argued that to live by labour, not by begging, was the true imitation of the Lord, and that to introduce into dioceses without the leave of the bishop, and into parishes without the leave of the pastor, preachers and confessors to steal the hearts of their people, was sure in the long-run to produce evil, whatever the appearance of good in certain cases might be. Saint-Amour was so able a disputant, that he was said to have held his ground in defence of the book before a commission of cardinals against no meaner advocates than Albertus, Aquinas, and Bonaventura.[1] Pope Innocent IV. bore somewhat hardly on the mendicants, but Alexander IV. took up their cause with such vehemence, that he refused his consent to concessions which even they themselves were willing to accept.

[1] Michelet, Hist. of France, i. 205. The friars had obtained an immense access of popularity by their noble devotion during the Black Death. Martin, v. 313.

In the constitutional history of the Church the reign of S. Louis is remembered for the Pragmatic Sanction. Doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of this document, which is a royal edict upon the election to ecclesiastical office; but it undoubtedly represents the principles of the French Church and State in reference to Roman claims. When we regard the rules and the records of Church appointments in France, we are struck by the number of parties who claimed a share in the transaction, and the impossibility of defining their respective rights. The people, the clergy, the chapters, the comprovincial bishops, and the metropolitans had all their rights, with ancient precedent to support them; but the measure and proportion of each claim were ill defined, and circumstances or special ability would give preponderance to one or other element among the electors; but over all these rights were those of the Pope and the king, each of the most indefinite and elastic character. The claims of the Vicar of Christ were such that nothing but opportunity seemed wanting to enable him to set aside every other authority, and engross by obvious title the whole appointment for himself; and the feudal system afforded, as we have before observed, a ready method of translating his spiritual demands into the language of secular authority. For although the Pope could not become universal temporal monarch in the modern sense, and take over the command of the troops and the administration of justice in the countries of Europe, there was no reason why he should not be feudal suzerain of as many as he could get to acknowledge him, and enjoy

all the claims of service and payment implied in that position. The powers, actual and possible, spiritual and feudal, of the Pope over France extended both to secular and ecclesiastical dignities.

On the other hand, the power of the French kings was growing in every reign. King after king incorporated outlying provinces, consolidated his power, and humbled his barons. In Church affairs the kings of France had never claimed so much as the emperors, nor had the Popes denied them so much. Investiture with the temporalities was theirs to give, and as these can no more be completely separated from the spiritual authority than the body of a man from his soul, they, as well as the Pope, possessed a kind of claim capable of indefinite extension as opportunity might serve. The more despotic they became over their subjects, the better able were they to represent themselves as including in their own persons all the popular privileges which they had devoured; and the time might be when the right of the king in opposition to the Pope should comprehend all the rights which the Church at large had ever exercised.[1]

But that period had not been reached in the reign of S. Louis, and the Pragmatic Sanction is only a series of saving clauses for ancient rights as against the Papal power. Prelates, patrons, and collators to benefices are to keep their rights. Liberty of election is to

[1] Michelet shrewdly remarks that the saintliness of S. Louis was a help to the ecclesiastical encroachments of his successors, through imparting an air of holiness to the race. Hist. of France, i. 260.

[2] On the sacredness with which the French invested their king, see Döllinger, Studies in European History, English trans., pp. 136, 268.

be preserved in cathedrals; simony is to be banished; all promotions are to be made according to law and the decrees of the councils; prerogatives granted by former kings are confirmed; the pecuniary exactions of Rome are restricted.

The successor of Pope Alexander IV. was Urban IV., a Frenchman. The small number to which his predecessor had allowed the Sacred College to fall enabled him to promote no less than seven of his countrymen to the cardinalate, of whom two became Popes. To Urban was due a project which was the source of many wars. He offered the kingdom of Sicily to Charles of Anjou, the brother of S. Louis. Thus he satisfied his national pride and provided a support to the Papacy in the perils to which the troubles of divided Italy exposed it; but he opened the land to a foreign power which has never in any age succeeded in conciliating her people. Urban died before the invasion was made; but his successor, Clement IV., shared his designs, and Charles was established on the throne of Naples.

The miserable condition of the Holy Land, urged by the Popes upon the princes of Europe, drew good King Louis to a new crusade, in which he laid down his life. Under his successor the second Council of Lyons was assembled, to consider the three questions of the reunion of the Greeks, the continuation of the Crusade, and the reformation of manners. It was the largest assemblage the Christian Church had witnessed, and the conclusions on the first two points were supposed to be hopeful; but the death of the energetic

Gregory X. put an end to practical measures in either direction.

Among the minor measures of the council we find excommunication denounced on those who pretend to rights of regale or private patronage in ecclesiastical appointments, or strain the rights they may justly possess. The ordinance of the council in restraint of new mendicant orders, and of the privileges of teaching, preaching, and confessing, to which they pretended, reveal a wide feeling of discontent on the part of the episcopate, though the Dominicans and Franciscans are generally excepted from their censure. But in the pontificate of Martin IV. a council of four archbishops and twenty bishops was held at Paris to censure invasions of the province of the clergy on the part of these two orders themselves. The mendicants appealed to the Pope, who confirmed their privileges, and decided that their title to hear confessions was unlimited, save by the decree of the fourth Lateran Council, which prescribed a yearly confession to the parish priest; but, in spite of this Papal utterance, the bishops did not give way. They summoned the University to aid them in the war, and a contest arose, both fierce and long, between the prelates and University on the one side, and the mendicant orders with the Pope on the other. The chapters, abbots, rural deans, and clergy were summoned to council to concert measures, and the earnestness of the movement may be judged from the fact that the bishops contributed to a common purse for its purposes one-twentieth, and the clergy one-hundredth part of their incomes; but they were not

successful. Pope Nicholas IV. confirmed the privileges of the two orders and added more: the mendicants were the army of the Pope.

The resignation of Pope Cœlestine V., too holy or too nervous to face the turmoil of Papal life, made way for the election of Boniface VIII., who bears an evil reputation, but whose chief crime was that he inherited the highest views of his political power with strength of will to assert them in an age when their force was impaired. In Philip the Fair he met his match for despotic pride; more than his match for subtlety. Opposition incensed him, and the reiterated bulls in which he asserted the superiority of the clerical to the lay power indicate a mind which was scarcely sound. The king was too well represented by his agents, Pierre Flotte and William de Nogaret, and the relentless hatred with which he pursued the old man compel our pity for the tragic scenes which ended the life of the Pope.

In the course of this duel to the death between the Pope and the king of France,[1] the demand of a general council appears. William de Nogaret, Philip's chief agent, presented, in a great assembly of French nobles and ecclesiastics, a request that all present should so exert themselves that the princes, prelates, and, above all, cardinals should agree to summon a general council to condemn the delinquent, after which the cardinals might give the Church a true pastor; and the king,

[1] See a comparison of the contest of Philip and Boniface with that of John XXII. and Lewis of Bavaria in Döllinger, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

having demanded the advice of the assembly, and received the assent of all to Nogaret's request, made solemn answer that he would procure the convocation of a council. The reply of the Pope was: "God keep us from setting so pernicious an example. Far be from us such guilty cowardice. Such an abuse must be cut off by the roots. What! they pretend to demand from us a council against ourselves. They cannot in truth assemble one without us." We see in this mutual defiance the first commencement of a great debate summed up in the words "the Pope and the council." With the fall of Boniface VIII. vanished the claim to constitute the clergy of France into a nation within the nation, holding only of the Pope; the monarchy of France had removed a great barrier which stood in its way towards despotism.

The successor of Boniface was Benedict XI., who speedily made peace with the king—too speedily, for there was more of political wisdom than of spiritual faithfulness in his gentle words to the tyrant: "Judge of our tenderness for you by the care which we have to anticipate your wishes in giving you what you have not asked—absolution from the censures you may have incurred." Benedict lived but a few months, and with him died a project which he had much at heart—the restoration of the Frankish Empire of Constantinople in the person of Charles of Valois. It offered the promise of a strong defence against the Mohammedan invader; but the substitution for the rightful empire, of an usurped dominion recommended only by its communion with Rome, was an expedient far inferior

to the loyal support of that empire itself by the sovereigns of Europe. The latter was the course which it would have become the Pope to recommend.

The Papal chair was vacant after Benedict XI. for more than a year. It was then filled by an intrigue, which had effects great and grievous upon every part of the Church, but especially upon France. In conclave, at Perugia, the French cardinals made a proposal to the Italian that the latter party should choose three names, out of whom the former should, within forty days, select that of the future Pope. The Italians named three, one of whom was Bertrand de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who, being a subject of the king of England, was supposed unlikely to subserve the king of France. But the messenger of the French cardinals was able to reach the king, the king to hold a meeting with the candidate, and despatch a return messenger to his cardinals within the allotted time. The messenger conveyed the royal assent to Bertrand's election. The consent had been given on De Goth's acceptance of six conditions, which placed his services at the disposal of the king. He took the name of Clement V., and his determination to be crowned at Lyons revealed to the Italians in the Sacred College that they had been duped.[1] Clement left Lyons in 1306, and pursued his way through many towns of France, exacting as he went such sums of money as reduced many bishops to poverty. In the month of April 1309 he arrived at Avignon, and the seventy years began during which France was the Papal resi-

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 461.

dence, little to the benefit of either host or guest. The introduction of a French dynasty into Naples, brought about at such sacrifice of Italian rights, was insufficient to set a French Bishop of Rome at ease in his diocese, and the king secured the presence of his accomplice in an act which stamps them both with guilt and infamy.

Philip was so avaricious and so unscrupulous that his extortions were among the causes of the decay of his own Church in spiritual efficiency; but his expenditure upon wars for the extension of his despotism was costly, and, like the Pope, he was ever in want of money. Early in his reign he expelled the Jews from France, confiscating their wealth for his treasury; but a large booty was possible in another quarter. He conceived and communicated to the Pope the design of abolishing and despoiling the Templars. Their order had become very wealthy and powerful, and it would be against all our experience to suppose that wealth and idleness should have failed to produce in their case the usual effects in relaxation of the rule; but they were accused of infidelity, blasphemy, and revolting sensuality.[1] The first inquiries were conducted, as of right, by a Dominican Inquisitor in France; he was confessor to the king. A number of Templars were examined by torture, and the natural result was that the admissions which it was desired to extort were in many cases secured. The Pope made a feeble protest against the acts of the king and the Inquisition, on the

[1] Michelet (i. 316 *et seq.*) believes the charge of renouncing the Saviour to have originated in a ceremony misunderstood; but see Martin, *Hist. de France*, iv. 476.

ground that the misdeeds of a religious order were cognisable only by ecclesiastical courts; but he was easily appeased, and the confessions of most importance in the whole process were made at Chinon by the Grand-Master and four other chiefs of the order under torture before three cardinals, acting under a commission from his Holiness. They confirmed the worst accusations.

Informed by his cardinals, Clement issued a bull in which he summoned a general council to be held in two years' time to deliberate upon the question of the Templars, the deliverance of the Holy Land, and the moral reform of the Church; and meanwhile he appointed seven commissioners to examine the members of the order in general. This body proceeded with a certain fairness; but extremely few of the Templars were fitted by education to plead for their order. They were ignorant soldiers, and in questions of faith and heresy it was forbidden to depute advocates to speak. Four defenders of the order were, however, chosen from its ranks, while the Grand-Master, Jacques de Molay, appealed to the Pope. The commission dragged on; but a speedier method was found. Philip de Marigny, Archbishop of Sens, held his provincial council at Paris, and, in spite of the reclamations of the Papal commissioners, who represented that the majority of the accused denied their guilt, fifty-four Templars were burnt alive by its order. Six others were similarly executed at Senlis by the Archbishop of Reims. The council duly assembled at Vienne in 1311. The prelates, with the exception of four, including the

two archbishops above named, determined that the case of the Templars had not been sufficiently sifted, and that, as the Pope required the advice of the council, the accused should appear before it.

But three months after this decree had been passed the Pope abolished the order in secret consistory. He reserved to himself the judgment of the Grand-Master and some others; but, on the plea of press of occupation, he deputed the business to two cardinals and an archbishop, with directions to associate with themselves other prelates, including especially the Archbishop of Sens. They took a year to perform their task, although it was simply that of passing sentence for the crimes admitted at Chinon. The punishment of heretics who had confessed their crime would have been perpetual imprisonment; but the Grand Master and one of his companions, in full knowledge that they were condemning themselves to the fire as relapsed, renounced the accusations against their order, which had been wrested from them by torture, and protested their innocence in the presence of their judges. They were condemned by the royal council without further process. The story that De Molay at the stake cited Pope and king to meet him before the throne of God, gives us, if true, the belief of the dying man; if invented, the popular impression of the kind of justice that the Vicar of Christ and the eldest son of the Church had done. Large parts of the wealth of the fallen order passed to the hands of both the secular and the sacred conspirators.

CHAPTER X.

THE POPES IN FRANCE.

Council of Vienne and Church reform—Franciscan divisions—Pope John XXII.—Conference of Vincennes—The Beatific Vision—Disorders of the Church—Power of taxing the clergy—Persecution of the Vaudois—The Pope's return to Rome.

It was little likely that any effectual measures of Church reform would be carried out by men capable of such acts as this; but the Pope had directed the bishops to lay before the Council of Vienne memoirs on the state of the Church, and of these some remain to inform us what it was. Complaint was made of the lavish use of excommunication by incompetent priests; in one case seven hundred excommunicated persons existed in one parish. As a natural result, the Church's censures were quite despised. The ancient canons, which enjoined care in ordinations, were fallen into neglect, and in many places "the priests were less esteemed than the Jews." Scandalous clerks from all countries repaired to Rome, and there obtained benefices so easily and in such numbers that the bishops had nothing to give their deserving clergy. In one cathedral containing thirty prebends, the bishop, in the course of twenty years, had only filled two; and in this case the Pope's nominees were all strangers, who never set foot in the parishes the revenues of which

they enjoyed. Men who had studied in various faculties and spent their means upon their training and education received nothing. Meanwhile individuals incapable of any service often possessed four, five, sometimes twelve appointments in various churches, engrossing the salaries which would have sufficed for fifty or sixty pious clergy. The parish clergy clothed themselves in showy attire. The canons walked up and down the nave while the office was being said in the choir, and those who did remain there talked and laughed while others chanted.

A memoir from the pen of Gulielmus Durandus, Bishop of Mende, and nephew of the illustrious canonist and liturgiologist who bore the same name, states the remedy. It was restoration of the primitive discipline, provincial councils regularly held, enforced residence, abolition of pluralities and of exemptions. Exemptions, he allows, may have been of use formerly; now they are become mischievous and ruin subordination, the more so because the cardinals give away conventual priories and other monastic benefices to secular clergy, to laymen, and even to women; and the monks, thus left without a head, abandon themselves to vice. The richer the order the more likely was this to happen, and it was the deathblow of the Cluniacs and Cistercians, the celebrity of whose communities had attracted legacies and gifts. The only true workers for souls were to be found among the mendicants; yet Durandus does not approve of mendicancy as a means of livelihood. Labour, or a common provision, enough, but not too much, seem to him better.

Education was spreading to some extent, and Durandus complains that, among educated persons, few know anything of theology or religion, which are therefore laughed at by unbelievers. This comes, he thinks, of all the glosses and subtleties, which extinguish the study of Scripture itself. He would have select doctors chosen to compose text-books of reasonable compass on each branch of knowledge. The universities should be reformed, and the scholars obliged to apply themselves to study instead of vanity; and in every diocese a tenth of the benefices should be reserved for poor university students in each faculty.

At the council itself the question of exemptions was debated with much heat, the one side regarding them as the destruction of discipline, the other as a necessary means of delivering the workers for God from the tyrannies and the hindrances of unspiritual bishops.

The Council of Vienne had before it an important religious difference among the members of the order of S. Francis. That order presented in its inception and its progress a miniature of Christianity itself. In the Church at large there have ever been those in whom the first fervour of evangelical faith has renewed itself with little care for subordination, and those in whom regard for established order has tempered individual zeal; and so it was with the Franciscans. The Friars Minor were in closest contact and sympathy with the people; and the movement in question arose in Southern France, where all the terrors of the Inquisition could not compel a fervid population to place its faith at the disposal of constituted authority. The chief author of the Fran-

ciscan schism was Pierre Jean d'Olive, a native of Languedoc. His quarrel with his superiors was upon the relaxations which had been introduced into the original rule. Resistance to authority in the Church at large has been often accompanied by an appeal to primitive Christianity, and these primitive Franciscans were commonly called the Zealots, the Apostolics, or the Spiritual, while the advocates of an easier observance were called the Brethren of the Community. The Albigenses who had survived the methods of conversion applied by the Inquisition formed relations with the Franciscan zealots, and the sect was designated Beguins, Fratricelli, Begards, or Bezognes. The Council of Vienne propounded a constitution for the Franciscans, but the difference lay deeper than external rules could reach, and the schism was not arrested.

Intellectual progress advanced through all this period with the irresistible strength which belongs to it, but many of the greatest names which carried the lamp only belonged to France because her University was the centre of European thought, and her public afforded the audience which every great lecturer desired to affect. Thus alone could she claim for French history Roger Bacon, the English Franciscan, a universal genius, who endured ten years' imprisonment for his speculations; Ockam, a second Englishman, the work of whose practical life was opposition to the political claims of the Papacy; and Raymond Lully, who possessed a method of philosophy which claimed to include all knowledge. He desired to employ it in a peaceful crusade for the conversion of the Mohammedans, and

died nobly, at the age of eighty, from the wounds received in missionary work in Africa. These were great men, but the conditions of thought and teaching bred an unlimited subtlety, which increased the more with the ability of the teachers and the necessity of ever discovering some new line, while the vast regions which free inquiry and the world of nature can offer were still shut up.

The death of Clement V. was followed by a long delay in the election of a Pope. The French and Italian cardinals were jealous of each other, and the intrigue which had placed the last Pope upon the throne was well fitted to increase their suspicion. Philip the Fair, himself the author of that plot, solemnly warned them of the possibility of a double election as the result of their intrigues, and at a later period it came to pass. The king himself died before an election, and the short reign of Louis Hutin was also over before it was secured. Philip the Long, when his brother died, was engaged in a commission to seize as many cardinals as could be caught and assemble them at Lyons. He had been forced to make oath that he would not shut them up in conclave, but he was advised that the oath was unlawful and need not be kept; the cardinals were therefore imprisoned, and in forty days elected John XXII., a pontiff of mean appearance, but able and courageous. He was French, and the strength of his national preferences may be judged from the fact that, in a few weeks after his election, he promoted eight cardinals, seven of them Frenchmen, while Italy secured but one, and Germany and England were alike unrepresented.

Before this unimposing judge the greatest questions of the Western world came for decision. First there was a royal divorce, as so often happened in the profligate history of the French kings. Charles the Fair desired to be divorced from his wife, Blanche of Burgundy, on the ground that her mother was his godmother. The days were gone in which a Pope was disposed to resist a king of France, and the dissolution was granted—an obvious sacrifice of the divine law of marriage to a scruple of human institution.

The still open quarrel between the Spirituals and the Brethren of the Community was brought before this Pope, who condemned the refractory subordinates to obey their superiors and change their habit, although they maintained it to be conformable to the prescription of S. Francis. Four monks refused obedience to this command as beyond the Papal powers. They were handed over to the secular arm at Marseilles, with a request that their lives should be spared, and, in obedience to the well-established meaning of that formula, were burnt alive.

Many incidental quarrels arose out of and varied the standing controversy between the mendicants and the secular clergy. Among them was the question whether our Lord and His Apostles possessed property. The Franciscans maintained the negative, the University took the other side. The argument upon the side of the Franciscans was that, if poverty be a counsel of perfection, the Lord, if He had not practised it, would have been inferior to S. Francis; while, upon the part of the University, it was contended that the use of any-

thing implies the right to use it, which is property in its principle. The Franciscans were condemned by the Pope, who anathematised the doctrine of Pierre Jean d'Olive, and caused his bones to be disinterred and burnt. The rebellious Minorites declared the pontiff a heretic, and some took refuge with Lewis of Bavaria, who maintained an Anti-Pope, while some fled to the Greeks to prepare the establishment of the coming kingdom prophesied in the "Everlasting Gospel," of which the mendicants were to be the apostles. The supporters of Lewis advanced spiritual claims on the part of the Empire which the Erastianism of the Reformers never exceeded; but Lewis had neither the astuteness of Philip the Fair nor his faithful body-guard of lawyers, and in this contest the Pope was victorious.

Better founded in precedents, and more formidable by far, were the claims in spiritual matters of the kings of France. Although the relations between John XXII. and Philip of Valois were very amicable, yet it was in the reign of this king that a solemn conference was held in the royal presence at Vincennes to determine, once for all, the respective limits of the royal and ecclesiastical powers. The summons, addressed to the bishops in the king's name, stated the obvious necessity that all members of the body politic should contribute to its burdens. Five archbishops and twenty bishops, with many secular lords, attended, and the debate was opened by the Chevalier Pierre de Cugnieres, who, according to the manner of the time, took a text, "Render unto Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's, and

unto God the things that be God's." His arguments went the length of requiring the bishops to renounce their feudal powers and confine themselves to their spiritual duties. Pierre Roger, Archbishop of Sens, answered on behalf of the clergy. He admitted the distinction between the two jurisdictions, but claimed that they might be both held by the same individuals, and prophesied that if the bishops lost their temporal jurisdiction, the ecclesiastics would be beggared, the bishops reduced to obscurity, and the kingdom deprived of one of its chief ornaments. The claim that the justice administered by a clergy possessing a tincture of education was better than that of ignorant laymen was probably very true. The assembly ended in polite assurances from the king, in which the bishops put little trust, that the clergy had nothing to fear from him.

The latter years of John XXII. witnessed a controversy in which the Pope himself escaped condemnation as a heretic only by retractations scarcely reconcilable with infallibility. The question in dispute was whether the saints before the resurrection enjoyed the vision of God. And the belief of the Pope was that while their condition was doubtless one of intense bliss, yet the perfection of it was deferred till the general resurrection, when the Blessed Virgin, the apostles, and other saints, should enter into the joy of their Lord. Strange to relate, the Pope pleaded the cause of liberty of opinion in a letter to the king, who assembled his divines and obtained their decision. It affirmed the doctrine that holy souls enjoy at once on their depar-

ture from the body, or their deliverance from purgatory, that vision of God which S. Paul describes as face to face. This Act was transmitted to the Pope with an epistle which thus prescribed his duty: "With regard to the question, Holy Father, in which your Holiness has shown so much knowledge, and gathered more texts than any doctor had hitherto known, without determining or affirming anything, or even advancing the opinion as yours, we beg of you humbly and with all our heart to put an end to it, by confirming with your apostolic authority, the truth of the sentiment in which the Christian people whom you govern have been maintained up to the present."

We see by this controversy that the whole question of the intermediate state remains, even when the belief in purgatory has been accepted. But the practice of adoration of the saints in the degree to which it was now carried prejudiced all questions about their present condition beyond the possibility of calm judgment. How could men resort habitually to the patronage of the saints, and especially of the Blessed Virgin, and to their intercession with God, if anything was conceived to be wanting to their perfection, or to the closeness of their intercourse with Him?

Benedict XII., who succeeded to the popedom, turned Romeward looks, like his predecessor. But the discords of Italy did not invite him, and so far from moving, he commenced the construction of that vast palace whose huge towers attract the attention of the traveller by the Southern railway, and contrast with the petty cathedral which contented the French

Popes for so long. Benedict was a good Pope; but autocrats are slaves to the system which they nominally rule; and although a good Pope must have had a great influence for good, the difference to the Church at large almost disappears in the view of history. Abuses seem no less prevalent under the best intentioned pontiffs, and at the beginning of every new reign the first step towards reform seems still to lie in the future. The efforts which Benedict made in this direction were really considerable, if the laws of human nature had not been all against him. To what purpose should he propound reformed rules for the Cistercians, for the Cluniacs, for the canons regular, and the mendicants, when obstacles so invincible as the accumulation of wealth and the decay of fervour stood in his way? But Philip strove in vain for the Pope's consent to raise tenths from the clergy for a crusade, and use them for the war with England. "Had I two souls," said the Pope, "one of them should be at your disposal. But I have but one, and I desire to save it." Yet it was but reason that the clergy should contribute when every class was suffering. Therefore the effect of the Pope's sturdiness was to oblige the king to deal with the clergy directly. For the present, the want of the tenths was supplied in part by a large use of the powers of the regale. In the year 1334 the king put forth an ordinance in which he claimed the patronage of all vacant preferments in a diocese during the time in which the regale prevailed—that is, from the death of a bishop to the termination of all the formalities by which his successor was placed in his room.

During the pontificate of Clement VI. the pressure upon the Pope to return to Italy became warmer, and found an eloquent voice in Petrarch. It had no effect upon Clement, who excused himself from returning by the necessity of attempting to reconcile the kings of France and England, who were engaged in the deadly campaigns of Crecy and Poitiers; but his purchase of the city of Avignon from the French princes of Sicily served to show that he had motives for residence in France of a less temporary nature than this.

The canons of the councils of France at this time make sad revelations of the condition of manners. The antipathy between the beneficed clergy and the wealthy laity seems to have been extreme. The laity claimed for the secular tribunals all causes of a temporal or mixed character, while the bishops regarded as spiritual all in which oaths were used, on the ground that an oath is an act of religion. In the year 1354 an organised demand for the suppression of the mendicant orders was made by a number of bishops and cardinals, and considered in full Consistory; but the Pope himself undertook the reply. "What will you preach to the people if the friars are condemned to silence? Will you speak of humility, you who are the proudest of men, the daintiest in your horses and your equipages? Will you speak of poverty, you who are so avaricious that all the benefices in the world cannot satisfy you? I shall say nothing of chastity. God knows every man's conduct. He knows how many there are who pamper their bodies and live delicately. You should not take it ill that the mendicants received some monies during the

plague which has been desolating the world, for taking care of the sick and dying, whom the parish priests deserted." Such was the Pope's view of the condition of the Church. But we must repeat that the mendicant orders were the Pope's army, and that the system of exemptions committed him to a position of hostility to the diocesan and parochial systems. Times so bad were approaching, that very competent observers looked back from them upon those of which we now speak as upon a flourishing season of the Church's life.

In 1355 the States-General met to provide means for the war with the English; and this assembly is remarkable as the first instance in which the clergy were taxed without the previous warrant of the Pope. The Pope, in his character of suzerain of all the benefices of the kingdom, required that no tax should be laid on them without his consent previously given. But from this period the impression began to prevail that the delegates of the clergy in the States-General had the power to grant the king the aid which he demanded. The letter of remonstrance which Innocent VI. wrote to the king had little chance of a reading, for it bears date fifteen days before the battle of Poitiers, in which the unfortunate monarch was defeated and taken prisoner by the Black Prince. The Pope had exerted his mediating power between the combatants to the utmost. His envoys had even persuaded the Prince of Wales to ask for peace, and the French king to consent, were it not that the latter was persuaded by the warlike Bishop of Chalons to withdraw. The confusion which followed the defeat both in Paris and

the country at large, the attempts made in the States-General to turn the misfortunes of the rulers to the advantage of the people, the rise and fall of Etienne Marcel, and the ravages of the Jacquerie, all furnished a rehearsal, only too true, of the Revolution itself. The companies of roving mercenaries, dismissed from the English service, who ravaged the country at large, were not likely to miss so promising a field of plunder or such valuable subjects of ransom as were to be found at Avignon; and the Pope, after preaching a crusade against them, was obliged to buy them off at the strangely assorted price of sixty thousand florins and the absolution of their sins. Innocent VI. seems to have laboured in the cause of reform. It is recorded that he compelled one of his chaplains who had twelve benefices to content himself with three. But without implying that all his reforms were of this nugatory character, it is at least certain that they were insufficient.

The successor of Innocent was another Frenchman, Abbot of Saint-Victor at Marseilles. Urban VI. received an early visit from King John, who was for the present at liberty, in which the king sought the permission to nominate four cardinals, and to raise for his ransom one tenth of clerical incomes for six years, the three first years being paid at once. The Pope parried the request, though the king added to other compliments that of taking the Cross. This pledge was never fulfilled, for the king, whether for honour's sake, or, as some said, for pleasure's, returned to captivity in England. Upon his death, his son Charles, surnamed the

Wise, assumed the crown under difficulties which demanded wisdom indeed.

Urban had been long convinced of the duty to return to Rome. There were many, indeed, to maintain that the seat of the universal bishop was not more properly in Rome than elsewhere: a vain argument to any who knew that Rome had been head of the Churches by the mere force of its position in history before its bishop attached its powers to his own person. Now the independent glories of Rome were gone, and Petrarch depicted its longings for the master from whom its present eminence was derived.

Italy far excelled France in literature and art. Already she had possessed her Dante and her Giotto; but the great poet's life of exile and persecution sufficed to show that her political condition made her no safe residence for eminence, however sacred; and the Popes might well pause when they thought of the dangers to which their return might expose the prestige of their office. The event proved that there was too much reason for such apprehensions; but certain circumstances tended to show that France had its dangers also. The military companies which Charles was unable to defeat he had himself taken in hand, and massed into an army to be used in Spain under the brave Du Guesclin.[1] On their way they levied a hundred thousand livres from the Pope, who in vain offered them absolution without the money; nay, it was made compulsory that the money should come from the Pope's own treasure, and not from a tax upon the poor

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, v. 257.

inhabitants of the town. Petrarch did not fail to use this forcible argument against residence in France, and he thus described the respective merits of the two nations: "The French have a gay humour, and are agreeable in manners and conversation. They are ready for amusement, and eat and sing well; but it is not among them that one must look for gravity of manners and solid virtue." The study of Dante would hardly lead us to suppose that Italy at this period abounded in solid virtue; but, in any case, her political unity and social order compared ill with the worst condition of France. The Papacy itself was much to blame for the Italian disorders under which it was itself to suffer; and whether we condemn the Popes who left Rome for Avignon, or the Popes who returned from Avignon to Rome, for the consequences which ensued, the primary cause of the trouble lay farther back, in the subjection to earthly interests to which the temporal power of the Popes had condemned an institution claiming to be divine. A trial was made of Italy by Urban V. He returned to Rome in 1367, but found a doubtful welcome. The feudatories of the Holy See refused to recognise his authority; and when two years had passed in anxiety and disturbance, the Pope determined to return to France. His appointment of cardinals during the Italian sojourn showed where his heart lay, for of eight, six were French and only one Italian. But the reason which he assigned for his return was the exigencies of the Church; and he addressed a letter to the discontented Romans, in which he declared that he and the cardinals had nothing

but praise for their conduct. He arrived in France only to die. The experiment of an election in Rome, which seven years afterwards proved so disastrous, was thus avoided for the time. His successor was Gregory XI., like him, a man of ability and virtuous life.

The year after this election the king of France published an elaborate ordinance which clearly defined the boundaries of ecclesiastical and civil tribunals. It particularly excluded from the cognisance of Church courts all questions of inheritance, and, in general, all causes which concerned property; and the royal officers were directed peremptorily to prevent the procedure of ecclesiastical tribunals in such matters. The Pope remonstrated, but in vain. The royal power, in spite of its late disasters in war, had arrived at assured superiority to that of the nobility; it was in a position to face the anger of the Church, and the ordinance now issued was not only a sign of the times, but in itself a mortal blow to the position of the clergy.

But there remained one sphere in which the State was willing to allow the Church free hand, and to place its own forces at the Church's disposition: that of heresy. To maintainers of the infallibility of the Church, her use of persecution must ever be a serious difficulty. The primary means of spreading the faith is a matter which not only concerns the Gospel faith, but is in itself an important part of the Christian creed. The spiritual nature of Christianity, and of the powers which it uses, was revealed by Christ with every possible emphasis, however Roman Catholics and Protestants alike may have denied it; yet we find the Church

of the Middle Ages, with the Pope always in its forefront, using without pity or remorse the weapons of torture and death. Men of high virtue in other respects lost all pity either for souls or bodies when heresy was concerned. S. Louis encouraged it. Gregory XI. ordered the Inquisitors to prosecute the Begards and the Vaudois, without sparing either monk or doctor. He implored the aid of the king. "Give not merely written orders," he wrote, "but send men of courage and zeal to execute them." He exhorted the temporal lords to give free scope to the Inquisitors, and he sent an apostolic nuncio to aid the tribunal. By the diligent exertions to which he spurred these functionaries, all the prisons of the country were filled in six weeks; and then the pious Pope had no wiser measure to take than that of building new jails and enlarging the old. This could be done, but heresy could not be extirpated, much less could that evangelical truth which undoubtedly was at work, however confounded and mixed with heresy. If the prevalence of error, real or supposed, had not been due to the failure of the Church to do her duty, or if the way of patient teaching had never been suggested as the true method of expelling heresy, we might have been the readier to excuse the error of the persecutors, though fatal to millions of souls; but the faults of the Church were admitted, and S. Martin and S. Bernard, not to mention S. Paul and the Lord Himself, had condemned persecution in Christian hands.

The Pope was bent upon return to Rome, moved thereto not only by ecclesiastical duty, but by the

revelations of S. Brigit of Sweden and S. Catherine of Sienna. It was in vain that the Duke of Anjou, whom the king had sent to detain him, spoke words which turned out far more prophetic than those of either prophetess. "Holy father, you go to a country where you are not loved, and you leave one where religion is more honoured than in any other place in the world. Your resolution may cause great troubles to the Church, for if you die beyond the mountains, as is natural to expect, the Romans will be masters of the Sacred College, and will force it to elect a Pope to their mind." But we must not ascribe this presage only to what the prince knew of the Roman temper: he must also have been aware that the French Popes had peopled the Sacred College with members whose presence was a defiance to the Romans, and whose tendencies unfitted them to conciliate Italian feeling.

It is said, indeed, that Italian jealousy had already made arrangements to appoint an Anti-pope if Gregory refused to return, and that his journey was hastened by the intelligence that there was no time to lose if he desired to prevent a great scandal. The Italian cities were overflowing with elements of intellect and insubordination which made anything possible, and which could not be curbed with a high hand.

CHAPTER XI.

THE GREAT SCHISM.

Great schism of the West—Opinion of the University of Paris—Peter d'Ailli—John Gerson—Election of Peter de Luna—French obedience withdrawn and restored—General Assembly at Paris—Council of Pisa—Alexander V. and the University—Council of Constance—Last years of Gerson.

POPE Gregory XI. arrived in Rome upon January 17, 1377. The Romans welcomed him; but a city whose parties and whose interests dated from the days of the Cæsars, and which had been without a ruler for nearly seventy years, could not furnish the quiet and submission of a country town of France, and the Pope retired to Anagni, where he was attacked by an incurable disease, and suffered sore affliction in his dying hours for the troubles which he plainly foresaw. He is said to have blamed himself for listening too readily to pretended revelations which urged his return to Italy. A French annalist maintains that the sinister events which ensued were not due to the return of the successors of S. Peter to his See, but to three causes—the over-eagerness of the Romans for a Pope of their own, the eagerness of the French cardinals to keep the dignity among themselves, and the imprudent conduct of the Pope who was elected. This judgment is wise and true; but of the three causes the first was

the least important; for not only is it uncertain what amount of pressure the Romans actually exercised, but they submitted, beyond doubt, to be baulked of their longing for a Roman Pope, and accepted one who was but Italian.

The particulars of the Conclave are differently related by Italian and by French authorities, although both are agreed upon the fact that the cardinals made a preliminary declaration that an election which should not be free would not be valid. It is also agreed that there was a certain amount of popular excitement. Under those circumstances the Archbishop of Bari was elected, and took the title of Urban VI. But whether the pressure that was exercised amounted to constraint is the question in debate. For some weeks after the election Urban was recognised by the cardinals. But violent discussions arose among them: the French cardinals fled to Anagni, and proclaimed the election void; and, after protracted communications with France, they nominated the cardinal Robert of Geneva as true Pope, and the great schism of the West began.

In any view, the character in which the cardinals displayed themselves was contemptible. No one seemed to suggest that it was their duty to have suffered a thousand deaths rather than name an unworthy man as Vicar of Jesus Christ. Martyrdom for the faith was recognised as the duty of Christians by multitudes of examples in their calendar of saints; and martyrdom in behalf of what they deemed error was too commonly enacted before their eyes in the persecutions of the time. Yet it was claimed by them, and con-

ceded by all, that the fear of martyrdom was enough to account for a breach of the highest trust which could be committed to members of the Church; and instead of passing the rest of their lives in abasement for the degradation to which they had subjected themselves and the Church, they used every opportunity which the circumstances of their new Pope afforded to supply their luxury and greed.

Previous Anti-popes had been raised to represent occasional interests. Never before had there been a Papal schism in which the authority of the electoral body could be claimed on both sides, and in which the arguments for each claimant were such as might persuade the fairest minds. It was manifest from the first, and confirmed as time proceeded, that the schism carried in it elements which made it impossible of solution by any powers which the Church had hitherto used. The supreme authority of the Pope in spiritual affairs, which was now generally viewed as a necessity in the kingdom of God, was here turned into a principle of disunion. In repeated instances throughout the course of the schism did it appear that no covenants or oaths made previous to election could bind the possessor of a dignity which had been taught by the agreement of Christendom to consider itself entitled to prescribe the laws of morality and to dispense from oaths. And it was natural that when once a man had found himself the possessor of such a trust, the duty to retain it should have assumed to him the appearance of faithfulness to God, even if it was falsehood to men, and the anomaly of descending from it

too great ever to be a duty. While we feel the utmost repugnance to the ambition and selfishness for which the rival Popes sacrificed the welfare of Christendom, we must not ignore such excuse for them as is to be found in the irresponsible powers with which they were endowed. It was only the logic of facts which demonstrated to the clearest thinkers of the time that the schism could never be ended except by claiming the existence of powers in the Church to which even the Pope must submit.

Clement VII. had a partisan in Italy in the person of Queen Joan of Naples; but her subjects were in favour of his rival, and Clement considered it prudent to take refuge in France, where the Papal residence of Avignon offered him a familiar home. The king demanded a decision from the University of Paris upon the great question. The faculties of theology, law, and medicine declared for Clement; the faculty of arts was divided. The votes of three and a half faculties out of four left no doubt of the response made by the highest scientific authority in Christendom to the question of the king. Both king and Pope received it with high satisfaction. Yet the real feeling of the University, if the nature of the royal question had permitted it to be declared, was in favour of forcing both claimants to submit to a general council.

The moral effects of the schism were deplorable. The rivals and their followers bombarded each other with anathemas and excommunications, and multitudes lost the slight respect for religion which the moral laxity of the clergy had permitted them to retain.

Those partisans of Clement who had possessions within the obedience of Urban were persecuted in person and goods, and resorted to their Pope for compensation, which he was unable in many cases to give. The opinion that a general council was the true solution gradually passed from the University into society, and the wise King Charles named it on his deathbed.

The court at Avignon included no less than thirty-six cardinals, all to be provided with the means of splendid living out of the benefices of the Church of France. Expectatives were readily assigned them, for the impropriety of waiting for dead men's shoes was unknown in the Papal court; and some of the cardinals were so loaded with preferments that even their audacity was unequal to enjoying the whole in their own names. Some were assigned to other incumbents upon condition of large payments out of the receipts. The house furniture of deceased bishops was claimed by the Chamber Apostolic under the "right of spoil," and the first year's income of all the benefices of the kingdom was claimed under the title of "annates," whether the demand conflicted with the king's regale or not. At the same time both clergy and people were subjected to imposts on the part of the Crown, for which Clement readily gave authority when required. The envoys of Urban, on the other hand, preached in England a crusade against France, and actually procured the despatch of a body of troops into Flanders, under the Bishop of Norwich. He proved a poor commander, and was shortly glad to be allowed to return to England uninjured. But while Urban declared himself

roundly against the general council, Clement sent his legates among the courts of Europe with the promise to submit himself to the decision of such an assembly —a proceeding which gained him many friends, but in the sincerity of which we cannot believe.

Amidst the trouble, the question of the universality of original sin came before the University in connection with the writings of a Dominican author. Whether the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin had never been decided. The Dominicans stood by their theologians and carried the point before Clement VII. At the head of the doctors whom the University deputed to Avignon upon this business was the celebrated Peter d'Ailli, one of the greatest names of the time; while his pupils Gerson and Clemangis accompanied him. The latter was tempted at a later period to enter the service of the French Pope, and became his devoted adherent; but Gerson remained attached to the University, which chose him at an early age to be its chancellor.[1] The stirring events of the time afforded to his genius the grandest opportunities, and he used them with unflinching courage and prudence; but his piety was his chief characteristic, and to have been named as a probable author of the "Imitation of Christ" is enough to prove his spiritual reputation.

Upon the death of Pope Urban his cardinals had an opportunity of restoring peace by abstaining from an election, or by electing Clement. They did neither, but held a Conclave, and elected a Neapolitan, who took

[1] See Bossuet's eulogy of Gerson in the *Defensio Cleri Gallicani*, Œuv. vii. 523, ed. Bar-le-Duc.

the name of Boniface IX. Certain negotiations took place between him and the Court of France; but it is tiresome to recount proceedings which, though they excited interest and hope in the minds of the faithful at large, were pure pretences on the part of the so-called Popes. There was but one tribunal to which the claimants were really agreed in appealing, namely, that of secular force; and if any persuasion upon their part could have induced the princes of their respective parties to take up arms on their behalf, there is abundant evidence that it would not have been spared.

The University of Paris was requested by the king to deliver its opinion as to the best expedient for terminating the schism. The measures taken to reply to this important question were elaborate. Every doctor of the University gave in a separate memoir on the subject. These essays were deposited in a chest, from which, after a certain number of days, they were taken out and examined by fifty-five doctors. All opinions reduced themselves to three—the resignation of both claimants, reference to arbitration, or a general council. The task of drawing up the answer to the king was committed to Clemangis, who produced a most eloquent address, in which the condition to which the schism had reduced the unhappy Church of France was movingly depicted, and the three methods of ending it were described and recommended. The preference was given to the method of resignation; but the University was not yet aware how completely impossible it would be to persuade, or even compel, the claimants to perform the act of surrender, however

great the facility with which they promised it. The council was the true method, and it is interesting to read the answer which Clemangis makes to the question, "Who will give the council its authority?" The reply is easy: It will be the consent of all the faithful; it will be Jesus Christ, who has said in His Gospel that He is where two or three are assembled in His name.

The University was obliged to press its report upon the king's attention by threatening to suspend its courses in all the faculties; and Clement, finding his cardinals more disposed to favour the report than to oppose it, fell sick from chagrin, and died in September 1394. Besides the general harm which he inflicted on the Church by the schism, he did special injury to the Church of France by encouraging aristocratic candidates to seek in the high places of the Church the wealth and power which the decay of feudalism lost them in the state. Accordingly, when Charles VI. was about to send a letter to the cardinals at Avignon to beg of them not to elect a successor to Clement, the Duke of Berry advised him that lay lords would be much more influential bearers of it than learned Churchmen. The letter arrived in time, but the cardinals purposely kept it unopened until they should have elected their Pope. Before entering Conclave, they individually signed a promise to forward the restoration of union under all circumstances, even if elected Pope. Their choice fell upon Peter de Luna, who took the name of Benedict XIII. He was a skilful diplomatist, but an obstinate opponent of

union. He now pretended an ardent desire for it, but the sequel proved the profession to be absolutely hypocritical.

An assembly so large and representative as to deserve the title of a national council of France concluded, as before, that resignation on the part of both Popes was the most eligible method of peace. The embassy of nobles who brought this news to Benedict had a splendid reception and the fairest words, but no more; upon which they determined on a course which in the end had some effect. They entered into separate negotiations with the cardinals. The king persisted in pushing the "way of cession," undeterred by the bribe of a tenth of clerical incomes, which Benedict conferred on him at the expense of the clergy.

The king of England, on the other hand, advised a general council, and time showed that he was right; but for the present the most potent suggestion came from the king of Castile, who threatened Benedict to withdraw his obedience if a more accommodating spirit were not shown. This idea took hold of the University of Paris, and spread from thence to the court. The kings of England and Castile adopted it, and the Emperor Wenceslaus, after a visit to France, came over to the same conviction. Nevertheless, the plan was a mistake, as appeared when France acted upon it, and withdrew its obedience from Benedict. The difficulties in providing for the various functions which had been assumed in the course of centuries by the Pope were extreme. Not the least of them was found in the case of the monasteries exempted from

episcopal control and directly dependent on the Pope; for these bodies were extremely jealous of their privileges, and feared that a temporary suspension of them would lead to their total loss; and it was much easier for the Church of France to withdraw the appointment to benefices from the Papacy than to prevent the king from assuming the vacant powers instead of re-establishing the ancient electoral rights. And it was by no means likely that, having assumed the powers, he would ever render them up again. Lastly, the nations which adhered to the other claimant could not be induced to perform their engagement of withdrawing from him. The cardinals who had abandoned Benedict displayed a selfish anxiety to save their own revenues from injury, and even to increase them amidst the confusion. He was besieged in Avignon, from whence he effected his escape, and treated with his rebellious subjects in freedom, making many fair promises, and, it must be allowed, with a praiseworthy absence of resentment for his ill-treatment; and, finally, the obedience of France was restored to him as hastily and by as overpowering a majority as it had been withdrawn. But the Duke of Orleans, to obtain this result, had made a number of promises on behalf of the Pope which the Pope, having obtained his end, showed no disposition to perform. Thus, as the chances of obtaining unity through any exercise of self-abnegation in Popes or cardinals on either side faded away, the project of a council impressed itself upon all thinking minds as the sole possible solution.

The discussion of the question at a general assembly

in Paris drew forth marked statements both of Gallican and Ultramontane principles. The Abbot of Mont Saint-Michel argued that, as the authority of the Pope had been established by God to maintain the unity of the Church, it was lawful to resist the Pope if he gave occasion of schism; while the Dean of Rouen replied that our Lord possessed both powers spiritual and temporal, and had transmitted them to His Vicar, S. Peter. But Peter d'Ailli, now Bishop of Cambray, and Gerson, the ablest men in the assembly, were opposed to the withdrawal of obedience; not from any attachment to Benedict, but from a conviction that a general council of the Church could alone weigh the claims of the candidates and demand their surrender. The passionate enemies of Benedict, whose voices prevailed in the University, were more enraged at these opinions than with the direct supporters of the Pope. But there were other powers than that of the Pope to fear. The advocate Des Ursins discoursed upon the theme, "Quit you like men, and your heart shall be strengthened, all ye that trust in the Lord," and deduced from thence "very grandly and notably, the power of the king of France, who is the right hand of the Church, and proved that it is right and just for him to assemble the ecclesiastical persons of his kingdom to counsel, and preside as chief among them when he is requested, and even without request of any one, when it seems him good, to come to conclusions, and cause to be executed that which shall be concluded and advised in the said council." We have here the theory of Gallicanism in the extreme and secular form which

recognises the superiority of the royal power to the ecclesiastical, even in things spiritual.

The conclusion was arrived at by the vote of the prelates alone. It was "that it is necessary to assemble a general council to reform the Church in its head and in its members. To hasten its convocation, the withdrawal of obedience shall be again published, and the Church of France shall enjoy its ancient liberties. The ordinaries shall present to those benefices the patronage of which belongs to them, and shall provide for the others by election and confirmation conformably to ancient right." The negotiation which ensued with the French and Italian Popes in order to induce their surrender produced an impression among the friends of union that the claimants were playing into one another's hands.

The project of a council received the sanction, first of the Italian, and then of the French cardinals. It was determined that the assembly should be held at Pisa, about the Feast of the Annunciation, in the year 1409; and both the Sacred Colleges issued bulls of summons. The Chancellor Gerson defended their action, and maintained that a Pope could be deposed, imprisoned, and even put to death, if the Church believed this necessary for its own defence. Peter d'Ailli published two treatises to the same effect, in which he proved that the council might depose the actual pretenders as fautors of schism and suspect of heresy, and proceed immediately to the election of a new Pope.

The leading spirit of the Council of Pisa was Simon de Cramaud, Patriarch of Alexandria, chief of the

ambassadors of the king of France. It was he who proposed the decree to proceed to deposition, and it was he who, accompanied by the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch, read the solemn sentence from the pulpit of the cathedral before a vast crowd which filled the building. It pronounced the two pretenders schismatic, heretical, perjured, scandalous, obstinate, and incorrigible; deposed them judicially and separated them from the Church; declared the Holy See vacant, and forbade the faithful, under pain of excommunication, to obey either of the two deposed claimants; and in case of the refusal of the condemned to obey the sentence, declared that they ought to be restrained by the secular arm.

The council then proceeded to the election of a new Pope. The cardinals were directed to assemble in Conclave, and each of them signed beforehand a declaration that in case of his election he would continue the council for the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members. Twenty-three of the Sacred College took part in the election, thirteen of the Italian, and ten of the French obedience. After ten days of deliberation they chose the Cardinal of Milan, Peter di Candia, who took the name of Alexander V. He was a man of eloquence, learning, and good life, and his appointment was universally approved.

Three further meetings of the council were held for the all-important work of reformation. But many prelates had already quitted Pisa, and many more were anxious to return to their dioceses. It was therefore determined to adjourn the details of reformation to a

council to be called in the third year of the new pontificate. And the Pope, in order to save his promise of continuing the council, desired that the future assembly should be regarded as a continuation of the present.

Alexander was a Franciscan, and remembered his order so well that a renewal of the old disputes between the University and the Mendicants took place under his short reign. A stringent bull of condemnation was launched at all who sustained the objections of the stated pastors to the ministrations of the friars. The University, fresh from its contests with the rival Popes, was in no humour to accept this exaltation of its ancient rivals, and excluded the Mendicants from the University except on condition of renouncing the privileges of the bull; and Gerson preached a remarkable sermon in Notre Dame in which he maintained that the parish clergy were prelates of a lower rank, and that their power in the cure of souls being of equally divine appointment with that of the bishops, could not be suppressed or suspended by the Pope. The bull was condemned by a University commis ion, but the Pope died before the question was settled, and his disreputable successor, John XXIII., revoked the bull, as a means of raising money in France, a design which had small success. Neither could the court extract subsidies from the clergy. The insanity of the king, and the miserable contests between the Dukes of Orleans and Burgundy,[1] had deprived the court of public respect; and Gerson made himself the inter-

[1] The murder of Orleans by Burgundy was justified by the celebrated "Thesis in Defence of T rannicide," by Dr. Jean Petit. Martin, v. 488.

preter of the general feeling of the clergy, when he declared their unwillingness to pay subsidies when the funds raised by ordinary taxes were squandered. Such exactions, he warned the king, were found from ancient history to have proved motive sufficient for deposing a monarch. This bold language was challenged before a commission of doctors of law at the instance of the court, but the speaker was acquitted, on the ground that he had only adduced historical illustrations. Servility to kings was no part of the doctrine which Gerson had learned from his great predecessors in the schools.

Rome had fallen into the hands of the king of Naples, and it was for this reason that the council which was to continue that of Pisa was summoned for Constance. It commenced its momentous work in the year 1414. When it opened, the Church was divided between three Popes. Neither Benedict nor Gregory was without adherents, but John commanded the goodliest part of Europe. His difficulties, however, were great, and his own character was the worst of them. The master of the situation was the Emperor Sigismund, who entertained the design of restoring peace by forcing the whole three competitors to resignation. His views met support in France, and especially in the University. Peter d'Ailli had never been a warm partisan of the proceedings of the Council of Pisa, which had elected a Pope without first making sure that it had an undivided Church to offer him; and D'Ailli represented herein a large body of opinion among the doctors of France. But even the

question of the Papacy did not seem in their minds so important as the question of reform. D'Ailli and Clemangis both produced works upon this engrossing subject, and Gerson prophesied, like a second Jeremiah, some mighty war to come. The signs by which he foresaw it were, the spirit of insubordination which penetrated society, the shameless use of simony in the Church, the awful chasm between rich and poor, the pride of prelates, the tyranny of rulers, the war of State against Church, the ignorance of priests, and the novelty of opinions, everybody interpreting Scripture and the institutions of religion for himself. "Is it not," he asked, "an abomination to see the luxury of princes and cardinals, who wish to have it thought they are more than men? One prelate possesses two or three hundred benefices. Abbots and monks are rather officers of the State than of the Church, and sit in parliaments. Open your eyes and see if convents be not places of prostitution, if cathedrals are not refuges for thieves, if priests do not introduce their concubines as servants, if the immense quantity of images in the churches be not likely to promote idolatry."

Gerson was a reformer who desired to promote reformation without breaking the order of the Church. We must deeply sympathise with him; but no man who observes how he and his brave companions strove for reform according to the rules of Church order and failed, can condemn without measure those other reformers who strove for reformation, leaving Church order to arrange itself as it best might.

The Council of Constance belongs to the general

history of the Church, but we must note that the representatives of the Church of France took their full share in its conclusions. In the critical period when John had taken his flight from Constance, and the Emperor had much ado to keep the council together, a solemn mass was celebrated, and Gerson preached a sermon, the substance of which had, at their desire, been previously submitted to the cardinals. It is therefore of the highest authority, and thus it states the nature of the unity of the Church: "The unity of the Church is in Jesus Christ through the influence of the Spirit and by the communication of His ineffable gifts. This unity of the Christian society is more fruitful, more extended, and nobler than that of any secular one. She possesses in herself by the Holy Spirit the power to preserve herself in unity. Jesus Christ, the indefectible Spouse of the Church, cannot repudiate His bride; but it is not so with the Pope, who is the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The Church and he may reciprocally repudiate the union which they have contracted. The Church, or the general council which represents it, is a power directed by the Holy Spirit and instituted by Jesus Christ, so that every man, be he even of Papal dignity, is bound to obey it." The members of the University of Paris present at Constance affirmed Gerson's principles in a memoir presented to the Council. "The Church militant," say they, "is more necessary, more noble, more honoured, more powerful than the Pope. The Pope receives from the Church the exercise of sovereign power, for he does not receive it save through the ministry of those who elect

him. Hence it follows that the power which is actual in the Pope is habitual in the Church. Jesus Christ, the Husband of the Church, has given to His spouse the keys of the kingdom of heaven, because, according to S. Augustine, when he promised them to S. Peter, this Apostle represented the whole Church. The Church lawfully assembled can in many cases judge, arrest, and even depose the Pope, because the Pope, receiving his power from the Church, may be deprived of it by her if he abuses it."

And this was the doctrine which was expressed in the decree, that "the Council of Constance being a general council lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and representing the Church militant, has received immediately from Jesus Christ a power to which every person, whatever be his state and dignity, not excepting the Pope, is obliged to obey in all that regards the faith, the extinction of the present schism, and the reform of the Church in its head and in its members." It carried the principle into practice when, for the crimes of Pope John XXIII., the council judged him unworthy of the pontificate, and deprived and deposed him really and veritably from that dignity.[1]

The Emperor desired that the council should have proceeded with the task of reform before the election of a new Pope. But in this the cardinals were against him, and they were supported by the nations of France, England, and Germany. It was impossible to resist such a combination, and Sigismund was forced to yield.

[1] From this moment may be counted the divergence of the Gallican from the Ultramontane theology. See Jervis, "Church of France," i. 92.

We cannot doubt that the frustration of his design was the death-blow of reform, and that in setting up a new Pope the reforming party were erecting a fortress and place of refuge for the opponents of their measures. The Pope had a historical position, and was heir to a tradition and head of a bureaucracy. If it was much to suppose that a Pope would loyally accept the new conditions which a council might prescribe for the office before he had been elected, it was more difficult to imagine that as Pope he would consent to modify a system which he had received unimpaired, and of which his own autocracy was the key-stone.

Pope Martin V., however, declared himself in favour of reform, and ordered the nomination of a committee to consider it, selected from the nations, with six cardinals of his appointment. But nothing effectual was done. The attention of the assembly was diverted to the question of tyrannicide,[1] and to the more terrible employment of persecuting John Huss and Jerome of Prague to the death. Huss, as is well known, was executed in violation of the Emperor's safe-conduct; and, sad to relate, the delegates of the French Church took their full share in the accursed work.

Gerson returned from the council dissatisfied. Would that we could say that this judicial murder was the cause of his disappointment. It lay rather in the frustration of his plans of reform and the abortive discussion on tyrannicide, to which the state of parties in France gave extraordinary importance. For some time he was unable to enter France through fear of

[1] *Ante*, p. 230, (*n*).

the Burgundian faction; and when he did, it was to Lyons that he repaired, where he passed the rest of his life in prayer, study, and teaching little children.

The court of France made considerable difficulties in adhering to Martin V. His dispositions with regard to the appointment to benefices were doubtful. To the University, on the other hand, his election was, for the same reason, extremely welcome. Since the withdrawal of obedience, the minor benefices had been at the disposal of the bishops; the more important were filled by election, but the court was ever grasping at influence in them. Neither method favoured the advancement of the doctors of the University, which hastened, therefore, to forward to the new Pope its rolls of names in all the faculties from which to select.

CHAPTER XII.

BEGINNINGS OF THE REFORMATION.

English war—Joan of Arc—States-General of Bourges—Pragmatic Sanction—Louis XI.—French conquests in Italy—Francis I.—Concordat of Bologna—Beginnings of the Reformation—Persecutions—Calvin—The Jesuits—Patronage of the great benefices secured by the King.

THE civil history of either England or France will tell the history of Agincourt and of the desolating wars which followed. The Dauphin of France was reduced to the possession of a few fortresses in Poitou; the English held the land. The wonderful story of Joan of Arc comes in the midst of the doings of Popes and councils to remind us that among simple country people religion was still alive. The shameful process of her condemnation was conducted by Frenchmen, but prompted and constrained by Englishmen.[1] We may observe, however, that if the superstition of the time be not accepted as an excuse for the murder of Joan, it should not be offered as an excuse for the other persecutions of the period. It is a most imperfect excuse. Whatever the superstition of the time, men were not left without witness to the duties of charity.

[1] The whole story is related at length, and with intense feeling, by M. Martin, *Hist. de France*, vi. 215–303, to whom Jeanne represents France incarnate, and her betrayal and murder a kind of repetition of Calvary.

However, if charity was wanting, it is not wonderful that they should persuade themselves of the witchcraft of a woman whose very sex had turned their weapons from her and smitten them with mysterious terror in battle. Ecclesiastical judges, the Inquisition, and the learned doctors of the University of Paris, all the Church's machinery for dealing with such offences, condemned her; but in any case, she had taken the sword. If she perished by the sword, there was a reason for it which did not exist in the case of peaceful preachers or conscientious worshippers according to their lights. The claim of sincere and devoted, even if heretical, thinkers, is in its way as true as that of innocent girls; and innocent girls themselves perished by thousands in the Albigensian crusades. Excellent French historians find a reproach against England in the death of Joan, yet can account for all the horror of the Church's persecutions by the ideas of the time.

The Council of Bâle and the condemnation of it by Eugenius IV. led to the meeting of the States-General at Bourges. The deputies both of Pope and the council pleaded their cause in turn before this assembly, and advised the king to reject all the decrees of the Council of Bâle which attacked the person of the Pope, but to make a selection of its disciplinary canons. These, with certain modifications and a preamble prefixed, were registered by the Parliament of Paris, and form the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438.[1]

It ordains that a general council is to be held within

[1] On the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, see Jervis, "Church of France," i. 98. Martin, *Hist. de France*, vi. 393 *et seq.*

five years, and in every seventh succeeding year (tit. l. c. 1). Every person of every dignity, were it papal, is subject to a general council (Can. 1). All reservations by the Pope are condemned, and dignities are to be filled by canonical election. The Pope must swear to observe this rule. Before the election of bishops and abbots the electors must confess, take the Blessed Sacrament, and swear not to elect any one whom they know, or have reason to suspect, to have given or promised any temporal advantage to secure his election. On election follows confirmation by the proper authority, for the granting of which no temporal advantage is to be accepted as a condition, or even as a free gift. And if the Pope shall be proved to have accepted such, he must be accused before a future council (tit. ii.). Liberty is given to the Pope to reserve one benefice in a cathedral where there are ten, or two where there are fifty, provided that he must not during his reign present to two benefices in the same cathedral or abbey (tit. iv. sec. 6). A third part of the prebends in cathedrals are to be conferred on graduates—the necessary period of study in a university being shortened by two years in the case of nobles (tit. iv. secs. 11, 12). Appeals to Rome are forbidden except in a limited class of cases, and in places near to Rome (tit. v. sec. 1). The number of cardinals is limited to twenty-four (tit. viii. sec. 1). Excellent rules are prescribed for the saying of the offices (tit. x.–xv.). Acting of plays and mock ceremonies, holding of feasts and revels, and sales and barter, are forbidden in churches (tit. xviii.). Con-

cubinage on the part of the clergy, and the condonation of it on the part of rulers, is strictly forbidden (tit. xix.). These canons and decrees of the sacred general synod of Bâle, the bishops, chapters, deans, abbots, ecclesiastical and scientific members of the universities, representing the Church of France, accepted, and the royal sanction was given in these terms: "We, therefore, aware that as priests are debtors to preach freely what they have heard from Christ, so the prince is debtor faithfully to defend and fully to execute the truths which he has heard from the priest, proved by the Scriptures, have given our consent."

Charles VII. displayed no disposition to carry out the Pragmatic Sanction. He was willing to avail himself of the plea of restoring primitive methods of appointment so far as to wrest from the Pope the various methods of self-aggrandisement and favouritism which he had usurped; but it was scarcely to be expected that the Crown of France, unceasingly busy in engrossing power, would allow clergy or people to exercise free rights of election. The patronage of ecclesiastical offices was one of the most valuable means at the disposal of the crown for establishing dependents at once powerful and servile throughout the kingdom. The Pragmatic Sanction was never loyally executed by the crown. The same monarch who approved it sought presentations from the Pope as if it had no existence; and the liberties of the Church of France, when they did obtain the Papal sanction, did so in a form which conferred the rights of clergy and people on the crown. Nevertheless,

the document is an important utterance of the spirit of reform which was abroad.

Eugenius IV. protested against the Pragmatic, but the first Pope who had time to take measures against it was the interesting but worldly Pius II. Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini had been a zealous partisan of the Council of Bâle; but his promotion evoked the usual change, and the Pope was an implacable enemy of the code which the Church of France had extracted from the decrees of Bâle. To the first French embassy which he received he pronounced a severe condemnation of the Pragmatic, and would have had them believe that the favour which he extended to the Spanish claimant of the crown of Naples above the French was due to the obnoxious law; but they were very well aware that it was caused by his apprehension of French influence in Italy. They therefore defended the Pragmatic without scruple, and departed as much displeased with the Pope as he with them.

Charles VII. died very miserably soon after, and his successor was Louis XI., in whom we see in unexampled measure the separation between religion and morality which has been found possible in every age and Church, but was peculiarly so in the period before the Reformation. He pursued his object of establishing despotism upon the ruins of the feudal system without recoiling from any crime; practising superstition at the same time with an abject terror which would have been pitiable in the case of a good man, but in him appears as a just punishment of his wickedness. Louis detested the Pragmatic for its inconsis-

tency with the royal tyranny, just as the Pope did for its interference with the Papal; but he gave his enmity the appearance of regard for the Holy See, and swore upon the Gospels to give satisfaction to the Pope; a design which his Holiness praised as worthy of a second Charlemagne. But Louis purposed to keep the Pragmatic alive as a convenient instrument which he could always threaten to use, and he presently despatched an embassy which attached to the suppression of the obnoxious law the condition of a recognition by the Pope of Rene of Anjou as king of Naples. Pius, on the contrary, supported the Prince of Aragon with all his forces, and heard with the calmness of a far-seeing politician the threats which Louis addressed to him. The king did not indeed mean all that he threatened. But he issued and put in practice against the rights of *dépouille* and expectatives, repeated ordinances which were more detrimental to the Pope's interest in France than the Pragmatic itself.

In the assaults of the king upon the power of the feudal lords, and in the cunning embassies which he needed for his tortuous policy, he found no better agents than the clever, unscrupulous churchmen of the time. Among these, Cardinal Balue was conspicuous. He was a sworn foe to the Pragmatic, and obtained his cardinal's hat for his services against it. His punishment when he offended the king was to be shut in a cage. He well deserved it for the crime, which was that of privately urging the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany to protract their war with the king. Louis desired that he should also be ecclesias-

tically punished, and the Roman Court was sorely perplexed between fear of offending the king and the desire to deliver a cardinal from a degrading imprisonment. He remained in durance, however, for eleven years until the terrors of approaching death induced the king to listen to the Pope's intercession for him, and upon his release he repaired to Rome.

Louis XI. died without ever completing his promised abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. The Parliament remonstrated against registering the decree for its abrogation, supporting themselves chiefly on the ground of the quantities of gold and silver which the Papal exactions removed from the kingdom, and which amounted in three years to two millions five hundred thousand gold crowns.

In the meeting of the States-General, held in the first year of Charles VIII., the observance of the Pragmatic Sanction was generally recognised by all except the bishops to be the true cure for the evils which oppressed the Church, and for not a few of those which plunged the people in poverty. The king was urged to maintain it, otherwise the kingdom, already very poor, would be despoiled of the little money which remained, and the little ecclesiastical respectability and regular discipline which anywhere existed would perish.

But the advisers of the young king were too busy with their personal rivalries to pay attention either to the misery of the people or to the demoralisation of the Church. If it be difficult for the historian to discover how far the Pragmatic was observed, the people of the time had the same perplexity. A certain Louis

Pot was nominated by the king to the bishopric of Tournay, and the Archbishop of Reims gave him institution. The Pope nominated another, but the Parliament defended Louis, and he remained bishop; while, on the other hand, Geoffrey of Pompadour, named by the Pope to the bishopric of Puy, prevailed against Pierre de Chalençon, elected by the Chapter. In this case the successful candidate was an official of the king. But a bishop elected by the Chapter was successful in the case of Matthew d'Artigaloupe, who held his ground by force of arms, with the help of the Parliaments of Toulouse and Paris, against four successive nominees of the Pope. Sixtus IV. feared a restoration of the Pragmatic to its full rigour in the new reign, and accredited a legate to France—no other than Cardinal Balue, who in this character returned to the land of his triumphs and troubles. But his entry was followed by a protest from the Procureur-General against any interference with the patronage of benefices, and he returned to Italy on the death of the Pope, having effected nothing.

The University of Paris no longer produced the intellectual giants of previous times. But if its lecturers lost themselves in vain subtleties, it still retained a high reputation. The new learning found a home there, and the all-questioning audacity of thought which presaged the Reformation was not without its representatives in the place. We hear of a certain Jean Lallier who maintained that S. Peter had received no more power from the Lord than the other Apostles; that all bishops are equal in authority and jurisdiction; that the priest has

powers similar to those of the bishop; and that as canonisation of saints is dependent on the expenditure of money, we need have no regard to that ceremony. The University required him to abjure his opinions, and Lallier appealed to the Parliament, which committed his case to the Bishop of Paris. The Bishop, after consultation with the Inquisitor, removed the censures upon a penance of great severity; and the various authorities had not resolved their disputes upon the case when it was summoned by the Pope before his own tribunal, and we know not what treatment the bold professor finally experienced.

Though the wars of controversy were beginning, the approved method of the sword had not fallen into disuse. Innocent VIII. requested the aid of the French king against the unoffending Vaudois, who were pursued into their mountains and slaughtered in great numbers for refusing to listen to the Papal missionaries. The persecution of these poor people, whose faith was of immemorial inheritance, suffices to refute the plea that Roman persecutions were only exercised on the originators of heresies and schisms. Anyhow, the plea is a poor one, for those who in times of great corruption commenced a protest must be less to blame for excesses than those who continue the movement when the Papacy has admitted a certain justice in the original complaint by correcting many at least of the practical defects which caused it.

The Court had formed the design of raising subsidies upon ecclesiastical property by its own motion. The country was so impoverished that the clergy had great

difficulty in obtaining their dues, and were ill able to spare any part of them; but the king had recourse to the Pope, who was well satisfied to be asked to consent, and a tenth was actually imposed upon the clergy for the purposes of war against the Turks, with permission to the king to retain two-thirds of it for his own purposes. Ecclesiastical censures were thus imposed in support of a tax, a small proportion of which was to be devoted to sacred uses. The relations between the French king and the Pope were of a very friendly character, when Innocent VIII. died, and was succeeded by Alexander VI., a name of infamy even among the Popes of the time.

Charles's anxiety to be on good terms with the Holy See flowed from his intention of invading Italy to assert his claims upon Naples. It was an unhappy project, not founded in justice, big with calamity, and disapproved by the wisest heads in France. The king pretended to represent it as a stepping-stone to a war upon the Turks, and the Pope did not hesitate to seek the aid of the Sultan in his resistance; but he was unable to hinder the march of the French army, which entered Rome, and received the custody of several strong places in the Papal States in order to ensure a safe return. But the French had to fight their way back against a combination of Italian powers, and the kingdom of Naples was reoccupied by the Spanish monarch almost as soon as his rival had turned his back. Thus ended the ill-considered knight-errantry of the young king, whose death speedily followed. The picture which Philip de Comines has left us of

the last hours of this ill-guided youth are piteous. Among the abortive designs of good which he declared himself anxious to perform, if time had been left him, were some ecclesiastical reforms. He would have been glad to have compelled bishops to be content with their sees without adding other preferments, unless they were cardinals. His last words were, "Mon Dieu et le glorieuse Vierge Marie, Monseigneur Saint Claude et Monseigneur Saint Blaise, me soyent en aide." "And so," says the chronicler, "departed out of this world so mighty and great a king, and in such a miserable place, who had such beautiful houses, and was building another. How well can we see by this example that God is great and our life a poor thing, and kings can no more resist Him than labourers."

The reign of Louis XII. commenced by a process of divorce, in which the sanction of the Pope was obtained without difficulty. No Innocent III. was now at Rome. Joan of France,[1] the daughter of Louis XI., was set aside to make room for Anne, the widow of the late king, who brought with her as a dowry the duchy of Brittany. Both the divorced and the substituted wife were pious women. Louis himself, though the hope of offspring and political advantage tempted him to this great injustice, was resolute in refusing to lay burdens upon his "poor people," and George d'Amboise, who was the chief instrument in the business, was an honest churchman, not only anxious to reform other prelates, but to show an example himself. A less creditable

[1] The sympathy of the people for this poor lady was extreme. They reputed her a saint. Martin, *Hist. de France*, vii. 304.

assistant was Cæsar Borgia, who gained his lordship of Valentinois and his marriage with a French princess as the reward of the convenient services of his father the Pope in the matter of the divorce.

Louis, in his turn, undertook an Italian conquest. It seemed more feasible than that of the distant kingdom of Naples, but it brought greater losses upon France. He claimed the duchy of Milan in right of an ancestress, and took possession of it with a fatal facility. The warlike Pope Julius II. negotiated and battled against the French with an implacable enmity until the fatal day of Novara, and an English invasion compelled the French king to loose his hold.

The Cardinal d'Amboise sought the Papacy, and might, it seems, have obtained it, had he been as able a diplomatist as Julius. Whether the appointment of the French cardinal would have changed the course of events, none can say; but D'Amboise effected some important reforms among the monks of Paris, and when the negotiations with the Emperor for peace afforded him the opportunity, he urged upon that potentate the necessity of a general council.

A council professing to be general was actually assembled at Pisa. It had a languishing existence, in opposition to another which the Pope summoned at the Lateran, and came to an end under Leo X. without effecting anything for reform. It need not be said that nothing in this direction was effected at the Lateran. The impossibility of a reform from within made itself plain.

Francis I. was brave and brilliant, passionate, tyran-

nical, and sensual. It was a satire upon royalty that he should have been the man to guide a great kingdom in a time of unexampled spiritual movement; but the interested connivance of the worldly-minded Leo X., together with his own unscrupulous love of power, combined to endow him with an authority in things spiritual which none of his predecessors had exercised.

The interview at which the fate of the Pragmatic was sealed took place at Bologna. The negotiations were conducted on the king's side by the Chancellor du Prat, who belonged to the class of statesmen who serve absolute monarchs, unmindful of any object but the advancement of royal power, and especially impatient of any independence in the Church. The Pope published a bull in 1516 which contained the articles of the Concordat, prefaced by a history of the efforts of his predecessors for the abolition of the Pragmatic. The new arrangement between Pope and king was in its very form an outrageous usurpation; the rights of the faithful were disposed of by the contracting parties without any authority; elections were abolished in cathedrals; the king was to nominate to a see or to an abbey, when vacant, unless the last occupant died at Rome; the Pope was to confirm if the nomination was according to rule. Reserves and expectatives were abolished. University degrees were required for orders, except by princes, nobles, and mendicant friars, and the time of previous study was fixed, a considerable reduction being allowed to persons of noble descent. Ecclesiastical causes, except those of importance, were to be judged in the place where they

arose. To avoid scandal and provide for the peace of timorous souls, no one is in future obliged to avoid the company of excommunicated persons, unless the sentence has been judicially pronounced, and the excommunication so notorious that it cannot be dissembled, concealed, or interpreted in any manner; nor is one obliged to believe all that is stated in a Papal bull to be proved in such a manner as to be incapable of disproof by witnesses or documents. In all demands made at Rome for confirmation of appointments the value of the benefice shall be stated in florins, ducats, or livres of Tours. Thus things were made easy for Papal appointments, excommunications were not to be regarded too seriously, the king was made master of the Church, and the Pope secured the payment of annates, the computation of which was to be provided for by the definite statement of the value to be lodged at Rome. The Pope surrendered to the king a purely spiritual privilege, and received in return a purely temporal advantage.[1]

The Concordat was to have the force of law if the king should secure its reception in his dominions within six months after its confirmation by the Lateran Council, but it was only after a long time and a hard struggle that the registration of the document by the Parliament of Paris was effected. The king displayed extreme violence of temper and contempt of law. "I shall force the clergy to obey me," he cried, "or send them to Rome to dispute with the Pope on the Concordat. I am king of France, and I shall not allow any one else

[1] See Jervis, Church of France, i. 106; Martin, vii. 460.

to be so." On the other hand, the Parliament represented with perfect clearness all the infringements of ancient rights, and all the openings for abuses and Papal exactions which the Concordat contained. It was forced to register the obnoxious treaty by threats of violence and by the assurance that refusal might produce another war; but the registration was accompanied by a clause stating that it was done, not by consent of the Parliament, but by the order of the king; that the registration would not prevent the Parliament from following the Pragmatic Sanction in all its judgments, and that the Parliament protested against the abolition of that statute by the assembly calling itself the Council of the Lateran, and appealed to the Pope better advised, and to a future general council lawfully assembled. The University united itself with the Parliament in its objections and protests, to which the king replied by abuse and by threats, and the Pope by a bull declaring all provisions null where the true value of the benefice had not been expressed. It was plain for what purpose the article upon the declaration of real value had been inserted in the Concordat, and what extreme importance Rome attached to this security that she should not be defrauded of her share.

The Concordat having been registered, with whatever protests and appeals to a council not yet in existence, became law. Naturally there were difficulties at first. The Chapter of Alby elected to their See the Archbishop of Auch, who obtained a decree of the Parliament in his favour based upon the Pragmatic; but the irritation of the king alarmed him, and he

retired. The archbishopric of Sens having become vacant, the chapter were forbidden by the king to elect, but the canons, who professed to have a special privilege to elect their bishop, learned the name of the king's candidate, and cast their votes for him. It was made plain by many instances that the clergy of France accepted the Concordat under compulsion, but equally plain that sooner or later it would prevail.

At the very time when the Church of France was engaged in this contest, Germany was fighting one more important still. Luther had sounded the note of the Reformation. In his controversy with Cardinal Cajetan the reformer had expressed the utmost respect for the Theological Faculty of Paris, but that body pronounced a solemn condemnation of his works at an assembly held in April 1521. The censure contained an account of Luther's tenets in 113 propositions gathered out of his works. He is pronounced to have revived the doctrine of all former heretics: of the Montanists, in refusing Church authority; of the Manicheans, in denying free-will; of the Hussites, in condemning penance; of the Wicklifites, in abolishing confession; of the Cathari and Vaudois, in attacking the privileges of the clergy.

Among the rest are condemned the propositions that God forgives sins without exacting anything except good life in the future; that God's punishment on sin cannot be remitted by the Pope or any other human power; that the theologians teach very falsely that it is impossible for us to know whether we are in a state of grace; that it is false to say that our Lord's com-

mand to turn the left cheek, and S. Paul's not to resist evil, are but counsels—they are precepts; that the pains of purgatory consist in the fear of hell; that it is probable that the confusion in which the souls in purgatory are prevents them from knowing whether they are saved or lost—they imagine that they are descending into hell, and their only consolation is to know that its gates are not already shut on them; that all the souls in purgatory are in a state of imperfect faith, that is to say, a state of languor, and were they to be delivered from their pains without taking away their sins—that is to say, the imperfection of their faith, hope, and love—they would still be in a state of languor; that it is contrary to the will of the Holy Spirit to burn heretics; that there is more good theology in the German sermons of John Tauler than in all the doctors of the universities; that since the invention of the Scholastic philosophy the theology of the Cross has been abandoned, and that the Church has been suffering for the last three hundred years inexpressible damage at the hands of its doctors.

As we read the long catalogue of condemned propositions, we find many which we disapprove, many which we should desire to study in their original context before allowing that they represent Luther's meaning, but also many containing the germ of a nobler faith and service than the professors of the University could comprehend. There is no charity, no sympathy, in the judgment; no allowance for the vehemence with which a teacher of the people must speak; no sense that Scripture itself is full of texts

which, taken by themselves, are subject to criticism. The Frenchmen were soon to find among themselves, in the person of Calvin, a reformer as logically precise as themselves; but Luther was wakening into life a national intellect which had not, as the French, a thousand years of drilling behind it. Luther's Reformation was Teutonic; his kindred English could catch its inspiration, and unite it, as is their way, with more regard to the past, and guard it with more stable institutions. It never maintained itself in any Latin race. The Roman Church went with the Latins and lost the Teutons.

But it was never again to possess even the Latins with the old submission. The revival of learning opened unlimited avenues of criticism. Francis I. loved to surround himself with men of culture; other splendours of his court were not so innocent. With knowledge came dislike of restraint, and the perception that the existing Church was not wholly warranted by the past. Some great people, who merely desired to be patrons of literature and know the most recent discoveries, found themselves, unawares, fautors of heresy. Bishops encouraged the new preachers, who could find their way to the people's hearts. Margaret, Queen of Navarre, the king's sister, went far in protecting reformers, and even persuaded her brother to listen to their preaching. They had little effect upon him. Whether a visit from Melancthon, which Margaret and her zealous friends had arranged, would have been more effectual, we do not know; for other advisers hindered the king from exposing his faith to such a

danger. Francis rescued a certain number from the stake; but in France, where religion and government had been so absolutely identified, and the burning of heretics had been familiar for centuries, the teaching, or even the belief of the reformed doctrine was generally more dangerous than the practice of crime.

In 1525, Pope Clement VII. sent the Inquisition into France, and specially recommended its officials to "judge without noise or judicial forms, as the custom is in cases of this sort." He gave them power to search for sectaries and those who favour them, to arrest, punish, and imprison them; to authorise the faithful to seize their goods, to reduce them to servitude, and deprive their bodies of Christian burial. The Queen-Mother, regent of the kingdom while Francis was the captive of the Emperor, followed up this cruel order, and many Protestants were burnt alive and otherwise persecuted to the satisfaction of the Pope, who wrote to express approval of so efficient an execution of his bull. The Parliament took an active part in the persecution, and the Bishop of Meaux was cited to appear before it. One of his priests was burnt to death, but the Bishop escaped on condition of paying a certain sum for the pursuit of heretics in his diocese. The same obligation was extended to all the prelates, and the Parliament censured them as wanting in watchfulness.

The University came into collision not only with Luther, but with Erasmus. In the controversy with him, the wit belongs altogether to the Dutchman. Dulness itself is the character of the French champions,

who attacked the Colloquies with more malignity than intelligence, while they permitted the students to read without restriction the corrupt writings of Poggio. The king, who was at this time inclined to tolerance, supported Erasmus, but this did not prevent the condemnation by the University of thirty-two articles from the works of the illustrious scholar.

Francis, upon his return from captivity, gave plain proof that his mercy to reformers did not lie deep.[1] He ordered a procession, in which he himself with his children took part, walking with naked feet and candles in hand. During the function six persons were burnt alive at public places of the city, and the king delivered a discourse in which he declared that were one of his limbs infected with the heresy, he would have it cut off, and were one of his children

[1] M. Martin (*Hist. de France*, viii. 215–217) gives his view of the relations of France and her rulers to the Reformation :—"Déjà la France a posé depuis longtemps de restrictions à son obéissance envers Rome ; elle est la moins Romaine des nations Catholiques. Ce n'est point assez. L'accord entre la France et Rome repose sur une équivoque ; le Pape se dit infaillible et souverain eu mutière de foi ; la France ne le reconnait pas comme souverain et le reconnait cependant comme chef. Ce n'est point ici une de ces dissidences secondaires où l'on doit se tolérer reciproquement en écartant le débat. Il faut au contraire que le débat se vide et la dissidence est capitale. Que serait un corps politique où le chef se déclarerait monarque alsolu et où le peuple ne le reconnaitrait que comme magistrat subordonné aux lois et aux assemblées? Ne faudrait-il pas que la question fut tranchée et que le chef renonçat solonnellement à sa pretention où que le peuple rompit avec le chef?

"Le temps était venu au XVI^e^ siécle de trancher le question. . . .

"La monarchie des Valois ne se fit pas de telles destinées. Elle ne sut pas se rendre indépendante. Elle ne se fit pas protestante. Elle ne fut pas tout à fait ni constamment romaine et ultramontaine. Elle flotta d'une demi-tolérance à des persécutions atroces et devint le dernier des gouvernements de la chrétienté ; car les autres avaient un politique et elle n'en eut pas."

touched, he would himself be its sacrificer. The fires were lighted in many parts of the kingdom, but the victims suffered with such courage and resolution, that the effect was, in the words of a Catholic historian, to convince the multitude "that they must have reason on their side, since they maintained their belief at the price of their lives." But the persecution brought remonstrances from the German princes with whom the king was allied against the Emperor, and in 1535 an amnesty was proclaimed to all the Protestant exiles on condition of abjuration. It was in the same year that Calvin's "Institutes" were published, with a dedication to Francis I. The work was offered as an apology for the reformers of the kingdom, and in power of writing and grasp of intellect it was worthy of the claim. But it was a calamity for French Protestantism that the stamp of Predestinarianism should have been thus irremedially fixed upon it, and an attitude of radical opposition to primitive Catholic principles assumed. Calvinism has made many strong characters, and many true workers, and was well fitted for those purposes of war for which in France it was so often needed; but it was not the whole gospel of Christ, nor the immemorial message of the Church of God. It could not be the faith of France.

It was but a year before this manifesto of Protestantism that the order which was to be its most obstinate opponent was enrolled. At Montmartre, on the Feast of the Assumption in 1534, Ignatius Loyola with his six first companions took their vows. Four,

with the founder, were Spaniards, one a Portuguese, and one a Frenchman; but it was in France that the order originated.

During the captivity of Francis I. the battle of the Concordat was continued. The Chancellor du Prat, who had taken so large a part in its concoction, reaped his share of its advantages in the archbishopric of Sens and the abbacy of St. Benedict-on-the-Loire, to both of which he was presented by the Regent. But he had a contest with the Parliament to secure his spoils, which was terminated on the return of the king by a high-handed suppression of objections upon royal authority. The king was not satisfied even with this. He demanded from Clement VII. an amendment of the Concordat, by which the rights of sees and abbeys possessing special privileges of electing their prelates were suppressed. The Court of Rome attempted to secure some additional monetary advantages in exchange for this surrender of the rights of its special friends; but they were refused, and Francis arrived without further concession at the object to which for so many centuries the royal power had been tending. He was in possession of the patronage of all the great benefices of France, and could fill them with his relations and his creatures. The effect was immediate. A good specimen of what it was to be is afforded by the promotions of the Cardinal of Lorraine, brother of the Duke of Guise. He was born in 1525. In 1534, being then nine years old, he received the archbishopric of Reims on the retirement of his uncle. He also enjoyed the archbishopric

of Narbonne, the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, Verdun, Térouanne, Luçon, and Valence, with the abbacies of St. Denis, Fécamp, Marmoutier, and others. Cardinals Du Bellai, De Tournon, and De Grammont were likewise high in the counsels of Francis I., and preferments were accumulated upon their heads. De Tournon was a bitter persecutor; but among the Cardinals of France there was none who did the work of a pastor or a preacher except Sadolet. He was not a Frenchman by birth, but his bishopric of Carpentras was in that kingdom. And there he devoted himself to his duties as if he had never known the luxury of the half-pagan court of Leo X. His sweetness in controversy drew a courteous letter from Calvin, and with Melancthon he was even affectionate. His way with Protestants was not to argue, but to recall wandering children to their mother. But questions of dispute were too effectually roused to allow any wide use of this method. Even if it had been feasible, there were too few on the side of the Church who had either the wish or the capacities to try it.

CHAPTER XIII.

WARS OF RELIGION.

The Vaudois—Project of a General Council—Assemblage of the Council of Trent—Henry II.—The Inquisition in France—Civil war inevitable—Colloquy of Poissy—The Jesuits in Paris—De l'Hôpital—Riots of S. Medard.

THE persecutions of the Vaudois were relentless and unprovoked, even beyond the usual measure. A large number of these pious people had settled in Provence, and turned the desolate regions which they had been allowed to occupy into fertile farms. They were in general esteem for their honesty. But they did not acknowledge the Pope, and so far were in harmony with the Protestants. Representatives from their body held conference with leading reformers at Bâle, Strasburg, and Berne, with the result that the Vaudois adhered to the new movement; and it was at their expense that the first French Bible, translated by Olivetanus, was published. Thus attention was drawn to them, and the Parliament of Aix, urged on by the archbishops of Aix and Arles, began severe proceedings. Francis I. interposed, but only on the condition that the accused should abjure their opinions, which they could not do. In 1540 certain inhabitants of Merindol were cited to the Parliament of Aix, and on their non-appearance were condemned to be burnt alive, their

households proscribed, and their town razed to the ground.

This monstrous edict met with much opposition within the Parliament, but the ecclesiastics removed all difficulty regarding cost by promising to defray from their own resources the expense of executing it. Again Francis I. stepped in to protect his unhappy subjects, and an order which forbade any officer of the Parliament to receive from the accused any document giving an account of their faith was quashed; it was strictly in accordance with the law of the Inquisition, but not with the law of France. Upon receiving permission, the community reduced to writing and exhibited the doctrine which they declared to have existed among them since A.D. 120. For their only rule of faith they had the articles of the Apostles' Creed. They believed the foundation of all good in man to be the regeneration of the spirit which God in His bounty gives to His elect. All men, as sinners, are in the wrath and condemnation of God, except those whom in His mercy He reserves. We are justified by faith alone, working by love. No human doctrines contradicting the Word of God were received among them. The sacraments were held in honour as signs by which the peace of God is confirmed and assured in our consciences. Magistrates were obeyed in things concerning the bodily life.

This statement of faith displays a difference from even the most Protestant bodies in respect of the institutions of a visible Church; but there was ample ground for charity and sympathy. Some of the villages

of the Vaudois belonged to the Comtat Venaissin, and recognised the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. They addressed themselves to the Bishop of Cavaillon and to Sadolet of Carpentras, who received them with gentle words and promises of Church reform; but the Vaudois had a cruel foe in the Baron of Oppéde, an official of the Papal Government in those parts, and bent upon extending his lordship by removing the proprietors at any cost. His barbarities were so great that the victims appealed again to the king, who again quashed the proceedings of the Parliament, and despatched officers charged to examine the case; but upon a false report of an intended attack upon Marseilles, the royal mercy was reversed, and an attack with fire and sword upon the Vaudois was commanded. Oppéde took care that none but he should execute the order, and the hapless population were massacred or driven into the mountains to perish by hunger. When the tempest was overpast, those who were left returned to their desolated homes and renewed their labour upon their barren mountain-land. It is said that the king, upon his deathbed, experienced remorse for the cruelties exercised in his name, and laid upon his successor the duty of doing justice to the persecuted people.

Meanwhile the project of a General Council was occupying the minds of statesmen and ecclesiastics. The Emperor desired it as the sole means of bringing his unruly Protestants to peace, and the king of France shared the wish; but the Pope remembered too well the Councils of Bâle and Constance to view with pleasure the prospect of another in which reform should

be still more urgently pressed. The two monarchs were jealous and implacable enemies to each other. Charles V. desired to act the part of Sigismund, and the king of France was determined to prevent him; but as the prospect of a war in modern times is marked by a fall in the funds, it is recorded that the rumour of a coming council caused a most serious depression in the price of offices in the Papal Court. Francis was urged to promote the council by the complaints of the king of England at the Cloth of Gold, and Clement VII. was disposed to please him in order to promote the private alliance which was on foot between their families. The Pope's niece, Catherine de' Medici, was to marry the king's son, Henry—a fatal present from Rome to France. But the preliminaries of the council were not settled during Clement's reign. The Pope desired that some town in his own dominions should be fixed on for its site, while Charles preferred that it should be in Germany, each in the same hope of subjecting the assembly to his influence. The king of France was in this respect favourable to the Pope; but, on the other hand, his Protestant allies in Germany considered that an Italian council would be committed to war with them. The council was adjourned until a distant term, when the Christian princes should be at peace.

But the project revived with the election of Paul III. This Pontiff, immediately on his appointment, was solicited, as a usual compliment upon accession, to confer upon the Duke of Lorraine the nomination to the bishoprics and abbeys of his states; but he made a

memorable reply, which contains the condemnation of the Concordat. "The Popes my predecessors," said he, "granted very wrongly this right to princes. I will not multiply abuses by committing the same fault, nor confer a right which the ensuing council will without doubt revoke." This promised well; but it was not so well that, a month after, his Holiness should confer a cardinal's hat upon Alexander Farnese, aged fourteen, and Guy Ascanio Sforza, aged sixteen. The one was son to his illegitimate son, and the other to his illegitimate daughter.

An actual attempt, however, was made to hold the council, first at Mantua, then at Vicenza. Both were failures; some said through want of sincere desire for it on the part of the Pope and the cardinals, while some attributed the difficulty to the incessant wars of the Emperor and the king of France. The question slumbered for three years, but in 1542 it was revived at the Diet of Spires, and the Pope suggested the names of some Italian towns, or, if they were rejected, Trent, which the German Catholic princes accepted.

The Pope summoned the council for the November of the same year, and sent his legates to preside; but France sent neither ambassadors nor prelates, and the Emperor displayed so much disposition to dominate that the Pope put off the assemblage for two years. At last, in December 1545, the council which constituted modern Romanism came to its birth. Its reforms produced we know in the course of time great effect, but it was long before they were decreed and longer before they were observed. The ancient canons, compelling

residence for the discharge of ecclesiastical duty, were renewed; it was laid down that no one, of whatever rank, should possess *in commendam*, or by any other title, two bishoprics; but fifteen years afterwards, four bishops were living in luxury at Paris, while sees were accumulated upon the heads of favoured individuals.

Francis I. died in 1547 of a shameful disease, the natural punishment of his persistent debauchery. This did not hinder the Bishop of Mâcon from declaring in the funeral sermon his belief that the deceased monarch was gone straight to heaven without tasting purgatory, a statement which the University showed a disposition to regard as heretical. The new king was Henry II., who possessed an attractive expression, and, it is said, much personal good-nature;[1] but good-nature without a well-informed conscience and resolution has always proved still more useless in kings than in private life. Henry had so little of either as to be guided by his mistress, Diana of Poitiers, and his commander-in-chief, De Montmorency, a sincere, hard, avaricious Catholic. Behind these influences lurked others more malignant still, that of the Guises, which for the present was exercised through Diana, and that of Catherine de' Medici, who kept the background during her husband's reign, and showed great complaisance to her rival. From none of them could the Protestants hope for justice or mercy. The Parliament of Paris, however,

[1] The only execution, indeed, at which Henry was actually present was that of a poor tailor, who was brought before him to satisfy curiosity. The man argued well, but answered a question of Diana's by a stern reproof. In one other case the king was to have seen the execution of a member of the Parliament, against whom he was incensed, but his own sudden death prevented it.

revived the decrees against the Vaudois, and their persecutors were spared, and even promoted.

A special chamber in the Parliament was instituted for cases of heresy, and the methods of pursuit and trial bore so much resemblance to those of the Inquisition that it may be regarded as a lay branch of that agency. It performed its work of burning heretics so well as to gain the nickname of *Chambre ardente.* The edict of Château-Briant referred to the ecclesiastical judges all cases of private heresy, where scandal was not caused nor other crimes involved, while the judges of the royal courts took cognisance of all public contradiction of the religious edicts of Francis I. In mixed cases the civil magistrates and those of the Church were to come to an agreement. Henry explained his proceedings as best he might to his Protestant allies in Germany, but these princes were obliged, for their own sakes, to use his assistance, and a motive for persecution more powerful than the desire to please them was the fear of throwing the Pope into the arms of Charles V.

The Pope received a more severe check from the works of Charles du Moulin than from the arms of either king or emperor. The Constable in introducing him to the king said, "What your Majesty could not do with thirty thousand men, this little man has done with a little book." It was a defence of the power of the king to forbid the sending of money to Rome, and it proved how from time immemorial the Gallican Church and the University of Paris had invoked the royal aid against the exactions of the See of Rome.

Du Moulin was the most eminent chamber-lawyer in France, but (at this time) he was a Protestant, first of the Calvinistic confession, and then of the Lutheran; and neither his learning nor the sense of his services entertained by the Court prevented his enemies from making France too hot for him.

In 1555 the Protestants, in spite of the rigour exercised against them, had reached immense numbers in France, and organised themselves into churches. The persecution was pushed to lengths which the Parliament itself could not approve. It refused to register a royal edict by which those convicted in ecclesiastical courts were to be punished by the secular judges without appeal—a system which would have established an Inquisition in every parish of France; and the Parliament added to its refusal the observation that all the punishments inflicted for religion had not corrected the error, and that the ancient Church had never proceeded against heretics by the sword and the fire. The Parliament, however, hastened to profess its orthodoxy, and even to approve the Inquisition when in proper hands. Whether by reason of this declaration or his own sense of the requirements of the case, the Cardinal of Lorraine urged the king to request of Paul IV. the formal establishment of an Inquisition in France. The Pope, who was equally attached to the methods of force, acceded to the request with great demonstrations of joy, and sent the king a present of a sword and helmet solemnly blessed at the feast of Christmas as symbols of the war to be waged against heresy. The edict by which

the Inquisition was established in France was only registered by the Parliament under the compulsion of a *lit de justice*, and in doing so it reserved a right of appeal for laymen from the sentences of the tribunal. The Protestants responded by holding their first synod in Paris itself.

With the accession of Francis II., the boy-husband of Mary Queen of Scots, the power of the Guises grew into a tyranny. The Catholics regarded these princes as heaven-sent leaders; but the Protestants found commanders well fitted to organise them in Coligny, Andelot, and Condé. New edicts of persecution encouraged delation and filled France with informers moved by the desire of plunder. They were relieved from fear of punishment even when convicted of calumny. Crosses and images were used as traps; to pass one without a reverence was a fair ground of accusation before the *Chambre ardente*. The numbers and the boldness of the Protestants began to render civil war inevitable, and the strange conspiracy of Amboise was the prelude. The leaders taken in arms were executed with such a cruelty that the Chancellor Olivier, who had been a chief instrument in condemning them, died of remorse without the sacraments. He refused to speak to the Cardinal of Lorraine, but cried after his departure, "Ah! cursed Cardinal! thou wilt damn thyself and us all." His place as Chancellor was filled by the wise and good De l'Hôpital, who owed his promotion to Catherine de' Medici.

The Cardinal renewing his suggestions to give the Inquisition its full vigour, the Chancellor consented to

the Edict of Romorantin, by which the cognisance of the crime of heresy was left to the bishops, to the exclusion of the civil courts. The Protestants gave to this proclamation the title of the Spanish Inquisition; but in one important respect it was an improvement upon former ordinances, since it provided for the infliction upon false accusers of the same penalties which they had tried to bring upon the innocent. It was at this period that the term Huguenot began to be applied to the Protestants, derived, according to Beza, from Huguet, which was the name in Touraine for werewolves or vampires.

In 1560 De l'Hôpital caused much sensation by the discourse with which he opened the Parliament. He stigmatised the clergy and their neglect of duty as the cause of the Reformation. He repeated similar sentiments in an Assembly of Notables summoned soon afterwards at Fontainebleau. Other orators also declared their opinion of the origin of the troubles and the method of suppressing them. Coligny demanded liberty of assemblage for the Huguenots, whom he estimated at 50,000 in Normandy alone. The Bishop of Valence declared that the Popes had been diligent promoters of division and war, that the clergy were ignorant and avaricious, and that the manners of the Court required correction: the two queens should substitute psalms or pious hymns for the immodest songs now so often heard. The Bishop finished his discourse by blaming the persecutions as a treatment of heresy unknown to the Fathers and the councils. The Archbishop of Vienne was still more outspoken,

and pressed for a national council to remedy the evils of the Church, and for the assemblage of the States-General to amend the condition of the people. The States-General were, in fact, summoned for the December of the same year, but the Guises used the opportunity to arrest the enemies of their supremacy. The Prince of Condé was tried before a special commission, and would have been put to death but for the death of the young king, after a reign of but seventeen months.

The next reign was nominally that of Charles IX., but really that of the queen-mother, whose policy was to play off the party of the princes of the blood against that of the Guises. The States-General were summoned at Orleans. De l'Hôpital opened the session with a speech in which he condemned the doctrine of persecution. "Those," said he, "who desire to plant the Christian religion with sword and pistol act contrary to their profession, which is to suffer violence, not commit it."

The Tiers-Etat, in its address, ascribed the evils of the time to the ignorance and neglect of the clergy, who always preached the same thing, and made the same sermon serve for all seasons. Their avarice was no less flagrant than their ignorance, and was the mother of luxury and display, by which they think to represent the greatness of God to the world: they would represent both much better by faith and righteousness. The nobles spoke in the same strain. The orator of the clergy declared that the Catholic religion must be maintained and purity in the ecclesiastical state restored, by re-establishing election to church offices,

and that the clergy must be relieved from taxation. To God's anger at the suppression of elections he traced all the evils of the time. The assembly adopted rules for ecclesiastical appointments wholly at variance with the Concordat: the archbishops were to be elected by the bishops of the province, the bishops by the bishops of the province, with the archbishop and canons, together with twelve elected representatives of the nobles, and twelve burgesses similarly chosen by their order. It does not appear that these regulations were put in practice; the Court deferred its answer to the proposals, and continued to appoint. The resolution of the States-General served but to prove the unpopularity of the Concordat.

The tolerance of Catherine was offensive to the Constable de Montmorency, who formed with Guise and the Marshal de Saint-André a league to combat Protestantism and the influence of Coligny. Excitement prevailed in the provinces, insulting slang was hurled and returned, and frequent collisions occurred. The queen advanced or retreated in the line of toleration as her policy seemed to demand. The king granted an amnesty, and then, as a counterpoise, he restored the Edict of Romorantin, but, at the same time, banishment was substituted for death as the punishment of heresy. The same Parliament which registered this decree resolved upon the assemblage of the States-General at S. Germain-en-Laye, and of a Colloquy at Poissy to follow, both having for their subject the troubles of the kingdom and the payment of the debts of the Crown.

The meeting of the States-General was marked by a

bold address from Bretagne, mayor of Autun, in which he attacked the clergy with vehemence, and demanded liberty and places of worship for the Protestants. He proposed that the necessities of the State should be met by a seizure of clerical property. The Tiers-Etat improved on the suggestion by proposing the sale of sacred vessels and of jewels belonging to the churches. Church revenue was estimated at four millions of livres à year, worth for sale 120 millions, out of which it would be sufficient to leave the clergy forty-eight millions. By some process of investment this capital was to bring in an interest not less than the original income of the whole. The financial scheme of the Tiers-Etat naturally did not approve itself to the clergy, who offered instead four-tenths for six years.

Religious affairs were deferred to the Colloquy of Poissy, in preparation for which Catherine wrote to the Pope a long letter, supposed to have been drawn up by Montluc, Bishop of Valence. She states that the Protestants have become too numerous to be restrained by force of arms. There are among them, however, no Anabaptists, unbelievers, or followers of monstrous opinions. They receive the Apostles' Creed as expounded by the œcumenical councils, and many zealous Catholics think that they ought not to be cut off from the Church; but, at all events, the best means of recalling them is zeal in preaching and teaching, exhortations to charity and good feeling; while those who have remained in the Church, but are troubled with doubts, have a right to expect the removal of scandals. Images should be banished from the churches. Exorcisms and

superstitious ceremonies should be removed from the baptismal offices, communion in both kinds restored, and services of preparation for the due reception of the holy rite should be held by the bishops with prayers, psalms, and Bible readings in the vulgar tongue. The festival of Corpus Christi should be abolished. Latin prayers and solitary masses are declared to be great abuses.

Such proposals from such a quarter were not kindly received by the Pope, who, however, despatched as legate to the conference at Poissy[1] the Cardinal of Ferrara. The Jesuit Laynez was already on the spot. The Protestants sent twelve chosen ministers, of whom Beza was the chief speaker.

Beza opened the discussion on the Protestant side, and expounded the doctrines of Calvinism; but he deeply shocked the feelings of his hearers by declaring his belief that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is as far from the bread and wine as the highest heaven is from the earth. Perceiving his mistake, he wrote to the Queen to declare that it was blasphemous to believe Christ absent from the Eucharist, but that His Body is not united to the elements. The Cardinal of Lorraine spoke on the succeeding day. He maintained the authority of the Church on the principle of Vincentius of Lerins that she teaches what has been received always, everywhere, and by all, and he defended the Church's Eucharistic faith, which indeed was the question of deepest importance in the minds of all the assembly. The Cardinal challenged the ministers to

[1] See Jervis, "Church of France," i. 40 *et seq.*

sign the definition of the Lutherans upon the Eucharist, and Beza replied by pressing his adversary to say whether this proposal was made by the representatives of the Church as a body; for if it were, then, thank God, there was an end of Transubstantiation, which the Lutherans rejected as well as the reformed. Laynez the Jesuit launched out into invectives, describing the Protestants by the four Italian words, *lupi*, *volpi*, *serpenti*, *assassini*. Beza replied in the same strain, and the discussion waxed so violent that a small committee on each side was deputed to confer.

In this smaller conference the Protestants presented the following statement of their belief in the Lord's Supper: "We confess that in the Supper Jesus Christ gives and represents to us truly the substance of His Body and Blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and that we take and eat spiritually and by faith that true Body which was offered and sacrificed for us, to be bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh, so as to be thereby enlivened, and to receive all that is necessary for our salvation. And because faith, supported by the Word of God, renders present the things received, and by that faith we receive really and in fact the true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, through the virtue of the Holy Spirit; for this reason we acknowledge and confess in the Supper the presence of His Body and Blood."

The deputies were, it is said, coming to an understanding upon the basis of this ambiguous statement when the Catholics received orders to break off the conference. The ministers were sent away with honour,

but the court was disappointed at the failure, which it attributed to the bishops. The latter drew up at Poissy certain articles of reform upon their own account, which the Cardinal of Lorraine presented to the king. They proposed the maintenance of the Concordat, with the condition that the king, having made his selection, should send a *congé d'elire* to the canons of the vacant place, who should elect the person named. Excommunication being the gravest of censures, the faithful should have great fear of incurring it, and it should not be pronounced for light causes. As for those who despise it, the king is requested to put them in prison, that they may be forced to repent and reconcile themselves to the Church. None are to be nominated as canons in cathedrals but clerks of the age of eighteen, of good character and moderate learning. Infants may be received in monasteries for training, but may not make their vows before eighteen in the case of boys, and sixteen in that of girls. Those who hold monasteries *in commendam* should receive orders, if their age permit, at once, and at twenty-five they should be ordained priests, and if they cannot preach themselves should pay others to do so, and they should reside in the monastery six months in the year. The clerks must regularly say the offices, and their chant must be pious, of a kind adapted to raise the souls of the faithful to God. The breviaries, missals, manuals, antiphonaries, and legends of the saints must be carefully examined, and everything omitted which is superfluous or unworthy. Pilgrimages are good in themselves, but as superstitions creep into them, and false miracles are

published, we admonish pastors not to speculate on the simplicity of the faithful: to instruct them with care upon the cult of images, and the other points on which the heretics base their attacks. Besides these and other matters of reform, it has been believed that the colloquy of Poissy recognised the society of Jesus.

That body had encountered great opposition in France. Their first attempt to establish themselves at Paris was defeated. Believing that the rejection had been due to the privileges with which they were endowed by the Pope, they renounced on their second application the exercise of any such privileges, and requested to be admitted on condition that their constitution and powers did not in any way conflict with the law of the Gallican Church or with the Concordats. The request was postponed by Parliament until the Bishop of Paris should have reported on it. That prelate consented to it on condition that clauses should be added safeguarding the rights of the ordinary, the parish priest, the University, and the religious orders; that the society should be admitted, not as a new order, but as a simple association, and by another name than the Company of Jesus; but, in spite of the consent of the bishop, the Parliament refused to register the Act of reception of the Jesuits, and sent the business to be considered by the conference at Poissy. There consent was given, subject to conditions similar to those suggested by the Bishop of Paris, and in this form it was registered by the Parliament in the succeeding year; and so the society opened its college in Paris, placing over the entrance the inscription, "College of the Society of the Name

of Jesus," under the impression that this slight change of title satisfied the condition of a change of name. But the University opposed their right to teach. A suit at law followed, in which the blind obedience which placed them at the Pope's absolute disposal, even though he should be at war with France, was assailed by the advocates, and they were denounced as an ambitious sect, certain to overthrow the State. The process went against them. The Parliament resolved that it was at liberty to consider the question anew, but the Jesuits continued their teaching without the authorisation of the University.

Before leaving Poissy the bishops were desired by the queen-mother to address a request to the king that he should demand from the Pope the authorisation of the marriage of priests, and communion in both kinds. The request was accordingly made, and the Pope informed the French ambassador that he had always considered these to be points only of positive obligation; but he could not give the authority demanded without consulting his cardinals. And the cardinals refused.

An assembly of notables followed on the conference, at which De l'Hôpital reviewed the troubles about religion, and traced them back to the reign of Francis I., when the kingdom was ruled by a young king who thought of nothing but pleasure, while Henry VIII. of England, his contemporary, lived no better life, and Rome was full of vice. From that time things had gone from bad to worse. The military proceedings against the reformers were contrary not only to the Christian religion, but to the nature of civilised society.

If we consider how it was that heresies in old times were defeated, we find that it was by the ministry of the Ambroses, Hilaries, and Chrysostoms, who cannot be compared to our present bishops without perceiving how badly the Church is defended.

The so-called "edict of January" followed the assembly. In it the Huguenots were commanded to restore all churches of which they had possessed themselves, to erect their temples outside the boundaries of towns, to hold no synods without the presence of an officer of the king; while, on the other hand, no molestation was to be offered them, and all penalties were suspended until the decision of the General Council. The prevalent excitement may be judged by a terrible riot which occurred in the church of S. Medard. The Huguenots, assembled to the number of two thousand near that building, were disturbed by the ringing of the bells, which the ringers refused to stop, pelting the bearers of the request with stones from the tower. The Huguenots sacked the church, and a battle ensued within the walls, in which fifty were killed or wounded. The Huguenots remained masters of the place, but the next day a Catholic mob treated their meeting-house with similar indignity. And the Papal nuncio reported to Rome that Huguenots were being daily executed; four had been already burnt for the profanations at S. Medard, and preparations were being made for a similar spectacle on the day on which he wrote.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SAINT BARTHOLOMEW.

Reassemblage of the Council of Trent—Proposals of the French—The Cardinal of Lorraine—Legal recognition refused to the decrees of Trent—War of religion—Assistance from the Pope—Edict of toleration and plot of a massacre—S. Bartholomew—Politico-Protestant League—Catholic League—States-General at Blois—Assembly of the clergy at Melun—Exposition of abuses—The Pope and the League.

MEANWHILE the Pope was compelled to reassemble the Council of Trent, under the apprehension that the French would otherwise be driven by the disorders of the kingdom to convoke a National Council for themselves. France was desirous that the assemblage at Trent should be a new council rather than a continuation of that which had previously taken place, for it was believed that the Protestants would never send deputies to a body of the character which marked the last. The French ambassadors even affected to treat the assembly as a new body, but in reality it took up the business of the former, and the two have ever been regarded as parts of the same council. The Italian prelates, of whom the number was large, regarded the council as an expedient for defending the Papal system against its assailants; while the French, or at least the most eminent among them, considered that it was called to reform the abuses of the Church, and deprive the

reformers of some of those subjects of just complaint which they found in the existing system.

The Italian bishops, with the legates at their head, recognised the subjection of the council to the Pope, and received directions from Rome at every stage. The French desired that the council should be free, and the Pope subject to its decrees.

The French prelates in the council were headed by the Cardinal of Lorraine. Their arrival was considerably delayed, and the ambassadors had much ado to induce the Fathers to wait for them. To the Italians it was a great object that as much as possible should be done before the Frenchmen arrived, for the report ran that the Cardinal expected to lead not only the French, but the Germans and Spaniards, and that he was about to demand the restoration of the cup to the laity and the disuse of images. The question upon which the Pope chiefly dreaded French influence was that of the duty of residence on the part of bishops, since a decree that residence was of divine obligation clashed with the claims of power which Rome arrogated.

In fact, the subject which it was the desire of France to place in the forefront was that of reform. It must be admitted that the Cardinal of Lorraine was a strange advocate of reform, for he constituted in his own person the most flagrant example of all possible abuses; and the Church of France was so full of infractions of every ecclesiastical law that its bishops dreaded reform as much as any, and were, for the most part, compelled to advocate it only as the national attitude which the

king imposed upon them. Nevertheless, the Cardinal of Lorraine addressed the council in a Latin speech of great eloquence. He cleverly avoided the difficulty of his own position by confessing in the name of all that it was with themselves that reform must begin. "It is in ourselves that we must look for the first cause of our troubles. Whom shall we accuse, my brother bishops; where shall we go to look for the author of our calamities? I shall say it, but not without shame and sincere regret for our life past. It is because of us, my brothers, that the tempest has arisen. Let us, then, cast ourselves into the sea." No such act of devotion was executed by the speaker, but the instructions placed in his hand by the court directed him to require reform in the whole Church, especially the Gallican, the use of the cup, the vulgar tongue in divine service, the delivery of sermons and instructions; and, finally, the king desired that the prelates of France and the whole council should pay all regard to the object of recalling the noble kingdoms already separated from the Church. Every possible concession should be made to their demands, such as the marriage of priests and the retention of Church property which they had seized. The French king was in a better position to understand the importance of the loss of England than the prelates of the Latin races, who formed the majority of the council.

During the progress of the discussion the French bishops, in a congregation of their nation, drew up a list of the reforms which they believed to be required

in France. They were excellent, and contained, among many other points, the proposal to add prayers in the vulgar tongue after the conclusion of the Latin Mass, and to revive the ancient decrees of Popes Leo and Gelasius as to communion in both kinds; the existence of a direction on the subject long previous to Leo and Gelasius, and by a Divine authority, was not named. But we have much reason to doubt the sincerity, at least of the Cardinal of Lorraine, in these projects of reform. The legates requested him to keep the proposals secret till the pleasure of the Pope had been learned, and he willingly assented. It need not be said that the proposals, once submitted to Rome, were doomed. On the other hand, the Ultramontanes failed to carry their definition of the authority of the Pope. The general voice of the German, Spanish, and French prelates was against it, and though the Cardinal of Lorraine would fain have passed whatever best satisfied his Holiness, yet, finding himself outvoted, he returned to the old opinions of the Church of France, and declared himself an adherent of the doctrines of Constance and Bâle.

The Frenchmen were quickened in their zeal for reform by letters from the king and the queen-mother. We can have no great confidence in admonitions of the kind from such quarters. In any case, the Italians offered an effective opposition to them, and the legates pointed out the material method of resistance to heresy which the Roman party by unvarying tradition preferred to any reforms; the king's envoy was told, in the name of the council, how much it was regretted

that his master had ceased to make war on his heretical subjects.

The Pope considered that when the council had thrown the mediæval theology into a consolidated system, in opposition to change, its work was done; and though the reforms which not only the best but the acutest minds had so long seen to be necessary were wholly unsecured, his Holiness became extremely anxious for the conclusion of the council; and the Cardinal of Lorraine, foreseeing that the assembly was near its close, determined to repair to Rome for the purpose of soliciting the title of legate, and the mission to execute the decrees of the council in France.[1] He was liberal in his promises of benefices. The Cardinal d'Este, at the age of twenty-five, was made, among other lucrative advancements, titulary of the archbishoprics of Narbonne and Lyons, in complete disregard of the rights of the king under the Concordat.

The astute intriguer likewise proposed to manage for the Pope the entire business of closing the council. The sole plausible method of effecting this was to carry a proposition for referring to the Pope the matters which the council had not had time to treat, and, as it would have been unseemly that the legates should have made this motion, they were instructed to leave it to the Cardinal. The plan was carried out, and the great council concluded with imperfect correction of the scandals which, by the confession of so many adherents of the Roman Church, had produced the rebellion against her. In the assent which the French bishops

[1] Jervis, "Church of France," i. 159 *et seq.*

gave to the Acts reservation was made of the rights of the Gallican Church.

But, to the great chagrin of the Cardinal of Lorraine, he found it impossible to procure from the court and Parliament of France the formal acceptance of the decrees of Trent.[1] The learned Du Moulin published a legal opinion which pronounced that they could not, and ought not to be received in France, since they contained many things which infringed the ancient liberties and immunities of the Gallic Church, and gave just reason to suspect a design of introducing the Inquisition into that country. The Cardinal, finding it impossible to compass legal adoption of the Acts of the council, procured their ecclesiastical acceptance in the province of Reims and other parts of the Church of France.

But the two religions in France had come to open war. The history of the Church becomes, for the time, a merely secular record, only stained by murder and treachery beyond most civil contentions. The more cruel and bloody the proceedings of the court, the more secure they were of obtaining the approval of the Papal envoys and of the Pope himself, and Catherine de Medicis, as heiress of the policy of Louis XI., rejoiced in the opportunities which the wars of religion afforded her of pitting the vassals of the crown against each other, and destroying them one

[1] Leibnitz was of opinion that it was the work of Providence, in order to preserve to France the rôle of a mediator between Catholics and Protestants, that she was hindered from throwing herself entirely into the arms of Rome by receiving the decrees of Trent. He could hardly give her that character now. See Quinet, "Ultramontanism," p. 87.

by one. The battle of Dreux, in which the Protestants were defeated, took place during the session of the Council of Trent, and solemn thanks were rendered for it by the assembled Fathers. We can see, as the struggle proceeds, plain indications of the close connection between Protestantism and civil liberalism, and this fact tended to bring upon it greater detestation from the court and its servile agents. Du Moulin, however, is an unimpeachable witness to the imperfections of Protestantism. He tried Calvinism, and was driven from it into Lutheranism, and thence back again into the Church, in spite of all the persecutions he had endured. He testifies to the want of national spirit in the generality of Protestant ministers, who came, for the most part, from Geneva, and found in Geneva the true object of their allegiance. In the consistories and assemblies of the Huguenots the ministers were masters, and took cognisance of all kinds of matters, usurping both ecclesiastical and secular authority. They passed sentences, imposed fines and compensations, arrests and imprisonments, and sent information to Geneva of everything of importance that took place in France, showing their design to reduce France to a democratic state, and make it, like Geneva, a republic.

The Chancellor de l'Hôpital was dismissed from the royal councils for opposing a Papal bull which authorised the alienation to the State of certain ecclesiastical property. Rome granted the request on the condition that the money then raised was to go to the extermination of the Protestants, in default of their submission

to the Church. The Pope who thus confiscated the property of the clergy for the purpose of massacring their flocks was Pius V., who was afterwards canonised. De l'Hôpital could not approve the publication of a bull which threw blame on the edicts of toleration, and proclaimed without concealment the policy of destruction; but Catherine had no longer need of the Chancellor to counterbalance the power of rival statesmen. Guise had been murdered before Orleans, and De Montmorency slain at St. Denis. Moreover, it would seem that she had already resolved upon "the S. Bartholomew," and naturally desired the authority of a Pope and a saint for her deed of blood. We cannot, however, accuse the Pope of granting the property of the French Church for warlike purposes without offering of his own. He himself raised fifteen hundred horse and four thousand foot, and sent them, under the Count of Santa Fiore, with a brief which stated that his fatherly tenderness towards Charles moved him to offer succour in the name of God Most High against the Huguenots, his subjects, who are also the enemies of God and the Church.

The defeats of Jarnac and Montcontour scarce seemed to have any effect in subduing the spirit of the Protestants, and the court had the less scruple in coming to an arrangement with them, since it had no intention of observing any pledges. Nevertheless, the Edict of August 8, 1570, which granted a partial toleration, was issued against the utmost efforts of the nuncio and the Ambassador of Spain, who, in the name of his master, offered three thousand horse and

six thousand foot for the extermination of the Huguenots. It was impossible to inform the unfriendly powers that the extermination of the Huguenots was intended by an easier method; but the impression that treachery was on foot prevailed widely among the Protestants. Coligny alone, the noblest of them all, was determined not to entertain it. He was so wearied of the horrors of civil war as to declare that he had rather be dragged through the streets of Paris than see them renewed.

The bait by which it was intended to draw the Protestant chiefs to Paris for their destruction was the marriage of the king's sister to their leader, the youthful Henry of Navarre. The king's declaration that the marriage should be performed, even were the Pope to refuse a dispensation, reassured the Huguenots, and brought Coligny to Blois, and then to Paris. The Pope did refuse, but the king was so certain that his Holiness would forgive the fault, on learning the excellent object for which it had been committed, that he counterfeited the dispensation to procure the consent of the bride. The story, never to be forgotten, of the massacre of S. Bartholomew need not be repeated here, nor yet the record of the rejoicings and thanksgivings in Rome and Spain. Would that we could point to any records of protest or regret from the Church of France for the hideous deed; but at least we know that the wretched king, in spite of the applause of the Pope, was so conscious of the disapproval of some among the nation that he invented the story of a Huguenot plot against his life, and the French have always regarded the crime as Italian in its nature and origin.

The Cardinal of Lorraine was at Rome in the eventful time, and was the king's agent in requesting forgiveness for permitting the marriage without the dispensation. Cardinal Bourbon, who performed the ceremony, likewise asked for pardon on the ground that necessity had constrained him, and that he was prompted by a righteous zeal. His holiness, knowing the good and entire affection of this good lord and the purity of his heart, willingly granted the pardon: the king gratified him with an additional bishopric, and the Cardinal of Lorraine congratulated his majesty on the "very Christian and heroic deliberations and executions made, not only in Paris, but all through the chief towns —better than ever I could have expected or desired;" and prayed God to give his majesty a glorious reign and a long life, "as his very Christian and very glorious actions deserve." The prayer was as ineffectual as the flattery was false. Charles IX. was soon in his grave, and Henry III., more despicable if not so cruel, filled his place.

The Protestants were not exterminated, and the rejoicings with which the crime was greeted had not even the excuse that it was successful. The party called Politicians, who, although not Huguenots, desired reform and were opposed to persecution, grew much more numerous after the massacre. Many Catholics found themselves combating side by side with the Protestants; and in February 1575 an assembly was held at Nismes, where the politico-Protestant league was organised. It was a species of independent republic within the State, having particular laws of

religion, government, justice, military discipline, and taxation. The act which established it was signed both by Catholics and Protestants.

The success of this union, in procuring terms from the king, brought about the formation of the still more famous League of the Catholics. Its objects were to defend religion and reform the State. The Cardinal of Lorraine was its chief author. Philip II. promised his aid, and the cardinal fixed upon his nephew, the young Duke of Guise, as its first head. Occasion for launching the project was taken from an edict judged too favourable to the Protestants. It spread largely in those towns where the Protestants had suffered most, and where it was feared that Henry of Navarre might attain the crown and wreak vengeance. In Paris the bulk of the members were wild fellows, ruined and ready for plots. The form of union bound them to devote their lives and goods for the holy union, and pursue to the death all who should impede it. Those who refused to join were to be treated as enemies and pursued with arms. The chief was to be judge of all disputes between members, and the ordinary magistrates could not be resorted to without his permission.

Thus while the French crown, with all its despotic powers and traditions, was in the hands of a trifler without character or conscience, the Catholic enthusiasm was at the command of a bravo whose ambition set life, whether his own or another's, at nought. The Protestant cause was far more respectable than either Court or League, for it included the moderate and religious of both sides, and it followed the fortunes of

the king of Navarre, who, though his weaknesses were great and his religion more an affair of chivalry and adventure than conviction, was a man and a leader of men.

At the end of the year 1576 an assembly of the States-General was held at Blois, when grave deliberation took place in the ecclesiastical chamber concerning the reception of the Council of Trent. The bishops desired it, since their power over the chapters was increased by its recommendations. The chapters and religious orders were for the same reason opposed to it. The Archbishop of Vienne proposed that the acts of the council should be published, saving the privileges of the Gallican Church, while application should be made to the Pope for a confirmation of these privileges. But this was rejected, lest the Pope, having secured the publication of the council, should afterwards refuse to confirm the privileges. At last it was decided that the king should publish the acts of the council, with reserve of Gallican rights, while intimation of this should be made to the Pope.

This matter being arranged, a discussion arose upon the old question of promotion by election. The bishops declared it useless to contend for it. The king would never surrender rights which his ancestors had possessed, and which the concordat secured. On the other hand, it was argued that election was the only method of securing good bishops, and that the Pope had no power to surrender the Church's right of election to the king without her leave. The address to the king was framed in the latter sense. He was

besought to restore the ancient form and manner of election to bishoprics, according to the canons. But the crown had too great an interest in the concordat to sacrifice it to the demands of the clergy.

A General Assembly of the Ecclesiastical Order of France, held at Melun (1579),[1] produced overwhelming testimony of the prevalent abuses. The Archbishop of Lyons expounded the facts in an opening address. Bishoprics, abbeys, and even parishes, were held by a miscellaneous multitude of men and women. In all Languedoc there was not found a single bishop to make the chrism at Easter. Twenty-two of its sees were in the hands of administrators. One bishop who was resident could find no priests to assist him: all were fugitives on account of the war. Languedoc, we remember, was the scene of the Albigensian crusade; as a natural consequence, it was a chief seat of Calvinism. Seven deputies were sent to the king to represent the scandalous manner in which the bishoprics and chief benefices of the kingdom were filled. The remedy suggested was the restoration of elections. But the king replied that the method possessed inconveniences, and that if it were established the existing bishops would have to resign.

But the weakness of the crown and its constant need of money gave opportunities to the clergy of urging the restoration of elections. It was placed with peculiar force before the king in the assembly of 1585, by the Archbishop of Vienne. "The right of election,"

[1] From this date the "General Assembly of the Church of France" was held every ten years. Jervis, "Church of France," i. 49.

urged this prelate, "is founded in divine law, and was approved in the States-General at Bourges under Charles VII. by the Pragmatic Sanction, and by the previous Pragmatic Sanction under St. Louis in 1228. It was ousted by the concordat between Francis I. and Leo X.; but this act was never consented to by the Gallican Church, which continues to cry: 'They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.' King Francis aimed at establishing an alliance with the Pope for the defence of his Italian dominions—but God brought his projects to nought. Where a dozen bishops fit for their duties could now be found, there were fifty in the time of elections."

The clergy took occasion at these assemblies to request of the bishops the re-establishment of provincial councils; and in nine dioceses the petition was granted. The records of these councils suffice to show that even in a time so turbulent, the bands of discipline and the ideal of Church order were not lost. But they display a total unconsciousness that the minds of men were roused upon the subject of truth, and that the time was past for treating the laity as children. Thus in the Council of Bourges, 1584, it is forbidden to pray or sing publicly in the vulgar tongue, lest any one should take occasion to judge rashly of the sacred mysteries, or of the sense of Holy Scripture. All the faithful, and chiefly the ecclesiastics, are exhorted to avoid all commerce with heretics, either in marriage or in business; not even to eat with them. Ecclesiastical burial is to be refused

them, and they are forbidden to enter a church except to hear a sermon.

It is sad to think of one half of the French nation listening to long expositions of the Bible, while all the goodly traditions of Christian worship were cast away and forgotten, and the other half practising the accustomed devotions with little understanding, and accepting the new creed of Pius IV. as a matter which it did not concern them to question.[1] One party, in its study of the origins of the faith, forgets the whole intervening history of the Church, while the faith of the other is fixed not upon the founder of Christianity, but upon the existing Church system. One party carries off most of the capital, while the other is permitted to retain the stock-in-trade and good-will of the house. An absurd air of play-acting pervaded the devotions of the time. Henry III., in the very midst of his debaucheries, had the notion of organising the members of his court and companions of his pleasures into a confraternity which marched in procession to Notre Dame, clad in white sacks, singing the *Salve Regina*. The Parisians, in the stormy days after the murder of the Guises, acquired the habit of marching in procession, two and two, clad merely in their shirts, the youth of both sexes leading the way; the priests were

[1] There is a sad amount of truth in the following words of M. Taine (*La Revolution*, i. 231): "Depuis plusieurs siecles et surtout depuis le Concile du Trente ce qu'il y a du vivant dans le Cutholicisme c'est bien moins la religion que l'Eglise. La theologie y est descendue au second place, la discipline y est montre au premier. Car en droit les fidèles sont tenus a croire a l'autorité spirituelle comme â un dogme, et, en fait, c'est a l'autorité spirituelle bien plus qu au dogme que leur croyance est attaché."

frequently called from their beds in the middle of the night to chant for these processions, which led, as might be expected, to gross immorality. In the period after the day of the barricades, when Paris was apprehending the vengeance of Henry III., the Capuchins marched in procession to beseech his forgiveness, bringing with them a former associate of his pleasures, who was now a Capuchin novice. This man enacted on this occasion the part of our Lord, while a woman represented the Blessed Virgin, and made belief to faint at due intervals. And when Paris was besieged by Henry of Navarre, a procession was organised which assumed the double character of military and ecclesiastical, and carried both objects of religion and weapons of war. One of the processionists fired his arquebuss with so bad an aim as to kill the almoner of the Papal legate.

Pope Gregory XIII. declined to express approbation of the League, and it would have been well if the Popes had maintained that position with consistency. The Guises, however fanatical, were not men of good life, and they desired to use the show of Church defence for their own personal advantage. Nevertheless Sixtus V., while declining to give public sanction to the League, put forth in 1585 a letter which served the party as well. It commenced by claiming something like infallibility for all Papal acts whatever. "The authority given to Peter and his successors by the infinite power of the Eternal King surpasses all the powers of earthly kings and princes. Founded on firm rock, and never shaken by any winds or storms,

favourable or adverse, it pronounces irrevocable judgments, and when it finds any contravening the ordinances of God, it punishes them by depriving them of their seats, however great they be, levelling them to the earth as ministers of Satan." A Papal judgment thus claiming to be irrevocable, would seem to imply the argument which a Roman Catholic bishop lately used in Ireland: that if we could suppose religious authority mistaken in politics, we should have no warrant for conceiving it right in matters of religion. Yet the judgment in question was afterwards regretted by the very Pope who uttered it. For it pronounced the King of Navarre together with the Prince of Conde children of wrath, and deprived them solemnly, not only of rights of succession, but of their actual possessions and dignities.

Henry answered with spirit that he maintained the declaration and excommunication of the self-styled Pope to be false; that as regards the crime of heresy, "M. Sixtus" has falsely and maliciously lied, and is himself a heretic, which shall be proved in a general council lawfully assembled, and that the princes and king of France had known well how to chastise the rashness of such gallants as this pretended Pope Sixtus when they forgot their duty and passed the bounds of their vocation. Means were found to have this reply posted in Rome.

The Pope's bull was a triumph for the League, but many good Catholics lamented it, and the Parliament stigmatised its style as so new and far removed from the modesty of the ancient Popes, that the voice of a

successor of the Apostles was not recognisable in it. The Parliament could not find in its registers that the kings of France had ever been subject to the jurisdiction of the Popes, and could not deliberate upon the subject until the Pope proved the right to which he pretended, of transferring kingdoms established and ordained by God before the name of Pope was ever heard in the world. The doctrine of the bull was generally rejected in France, except by the most fanatical leaguers.

The rebellious spirit of the leaguers produced expressions regarding the royal power as violent as those of the Protestant preachers. It was openly professed that the king of France ought to be reduced to the same condition as the king of England, whose power was limited by that of the Houses of Parliament. So early was the constitution of England known to foreign nations as a limited monarchy. Well would it have been both for king and people, if the power of the king of France could really have been assimilated to that of his brother of England. But the English constitution was not built up by men like the leaguers.

CHAPTER XV.

THE PEACE OF HENRY IV.

Murder of the Guises: of Henry III.—Henry of Navarre and the Pope—Conversion of the king—Accepted by the nation—Royal assurances to the Catholics and to the Protestants—The Jesuits—Absolution of the king—Edict of Nantes—The Jesuits restored.

POPE Sixtus V. received the first news of the murder of the Guises without much emotion, although a cardinal was one of the victims. This member of the Sacred College rivalled his brother in lust for blood and immorality of life; but in the party spirit which passed at that time for Catholicism, those defects would count for little. More powerful arguments on the king's side were that the Roman Church had ever favoured absolutism; and the Guises were slain in scarcely veiled rebellion. Their removal might well have presented itself to an absolute monarch as executions; far less arbitrary in their character than the deaths in prison or on the scaffold which were frequent in France in every reign, and with which no Pope had ever thought of interfering. But an interview with the Spanish ambassador forced the Pope into a different attitude, and he headed the party of the League which refused to regard Henry III. as a king or a Catholic, and drove him into the arms of the Protestants. "Nothing," says a contemporary, "re-

sounded from the pulpits but abuse, especially of the king, whom they called dog, tiger, heretic, tyrant. No preacher was so barren as not to find room in his sermon for a string of revilings against the king; no pedant so dull as not to make a couple of sonnets on the subject, nor any printer so miserable as not to work off from his press every day some foolish defamatory libel against his Majesty, filled with the most atrocious insults that could be thought of." Amidst the excitement Catherine de Medicis died, and as she was supposed (perhaps falsely) to have had no part in advising the murders, she obtained from a preacher an easier verdict than posterity has passed. "She did in her life much good and much evil, and if you think that she did more of the latter than of the former, I do not doubt it. This day, gentlemen, a difficulty presents itself, viz., whether the Catholic Church ought to pray for her who led so bad a life, and often encouraged heresy, even though at the end, it is said, she took part with our holy League, and did not consent to the death of our good Catholic princes. On which subject I will say that if you wish to give her on chance a *Pater* and an *Ave* you can do it; it will do her what service it can, and if not, it is no great matter. I leave you at liberty."

The Sorbonne was long since fallen from its world-wide reputation. But responses from its doctors were at hand in Paris, and served well for circulation in the character of deliverances of clerical judgment. Thus in the present crisis this body gave an opinion that the people were absolved and freed from the oath of

fidelity and obedience to the king, that they might lawfully and with a free conscience arm and combine themselves, gather funds, and contribute for the defence and preservation of the Catholic Roman Church against the efforts of the said king and his adherents. The League, thus encouraged, determined to rid itself of the Parliament, which disapproved its excesses. Bussi Leclerc, with a troop of soldiers, entered the hall of meeting, and announced that he was commanded to secure certain presidents and councillors as partisans of Henry of Valois. The Parliament, hearing the names of the first president and some chief members, cried, "We shall all follow them." All were accordingly shut up in the Bastille, and the League formed a new Parliament, which united itself by a solemn oath, many signing with their blood. The Duke of Mayenne headed the League, and the king, detested alike by Protestants and Romanists, retained but a few adherents, who were called politicians, or royal Catholics. The Papal legate himself was astonished to find that, without leave from Rome, on the strength of a resolution of some doctors calling themselves the Faculty of Paris, priests were generally omitting the words *pro rege nostro* in the mass, and substituting *pro christianis nostris principibus*. The king had no course open but to accept the offered sword of Henry of Navarre for the subjugation of his revolted subjects; but the dagger of Clement put an end to his difficulties.

The king died far better than he had lived. We cannot but think that he had a better self, which, with other training than that of Catherine de Medicis, and

other religious influences than those of his time, might have made him a worthier king of France than many of his predecessors; but the leaguers heard of his death with fiendish delight. The prior of the Dominicans, who had promised heaven to his murderer upon a case of conscience deliberately submitted, made boast of his share in the crime, and justly suffered for it a few months after. The Duchesses of Montpensier and Nemours were allowed to harangue the people from the steps of the altar in the church of the Cordeliers upon the death of the tyrant. The assassin passed for a martyr. It would have been a small thing had it been only the populace who gave him the title, but this was the verdict of the Pope himself, who compared him to Judith and to Eleazar, and saw in the death of Henry the effect of the thunders of the Church. Yet his excommunication had been conditional upon his failure to perform certain conditions, the time for which had not passed by. He had died with every expression of submission to the Church and to the Pope. Unless, therefore, the censures of the Church were intended rather to destroy than to convert, the exultation of Sixtus was unchristian. It produced the worst impression among French Catholics, except the extremest adherents of the League.

The latter party had the ear of the Pope, and filled him with mistaken impressions of the power of their faction in France. He believed that Henry IV. was powerless, and the League at the top of the wave. It was far otherwise. The new king was hard pressed for money, and his troops were inadequate; but he

had an enthusiasm to depend on which could not be given to his predecessor. From the first he expressed his desire to be instructed with a view to accepting the religion of the majority of his people, and though he declined to make an absolute promise to be converted, yet it was well understood what the event was to be. The victories of Arques and Ivry made it evident that no army could be gathered to oppose him without the aid of Spain. All this and much more the legate Cajetan learnt upon his arrival in France, and made known to the Pope, who showed himself so far aware of the truth as to forbid his legate to resort to excommunication of the Catholic adherents of the new king.

The king of Spain desired that his daughter should be married to a French prince and appointed to the vacant throne, while he himself should assume the title of Protector of the Kingdom of France. It was easy to see that whatever party identified itself with such a proposal to the high-spirited nation of France, would draw on itself final ruin. The legate himself received a meaning hint that his master must not expect to assume sovereignty. For when he presented himself with much pomp to make his address to the Parliament, he was about to place himself upon the dais reserved for the king, but the first president, taking him by the hand as if to do him honour, placed him upon a seat beside his own.

If the League was not united within itself, Henry also had no easy task with his own adherents. His Catholic supporters became impatient at seeing his promises of inquiry and instruction so long without effect, and the

more violent Protestants threatened that if he professed to change his religion they would continue the war. Pope Gregory XIV. assumed the earlier attitude of Sixtus V., refused to listen to Henry's agents, admonished good Catholics to quit the party of the king in fifteen days on pain of excommunication, and exhorted the leaguers to lay aside all disputes until they should have chosen a truly Catholic king, under whose shadow they should enjoy a happy repose.

A declaration from Henry appealing to a general council to instruct him, and promising to support and preserve the Catholic religion, was registered by all the Parliaments which recognised his authority, and those of Tours and Chalons declared the Pope's monitions null, and condemned them to be torn or burnt. Gregory himself was pronounced an enemy of peace, of Catholic union and of the king, an adherent of the Spanish conspiracy, and partner in the guilt of the murder of Henry III.; but what was more wonderful still, an assembly of the clergy at Chartres, including two cardinals and half-a-dozen bishops, stamped the bulls as void, unjust, and suggested by the enemies of France. A kind of pragmatic was devised to regulate questions of provisions and dispensations while the misunderstanding with Rome might continue. The bulls, and the treatment they met in France, caused immense excitement, and no French lawyer even among the leaguers was found ultramontane enough to undertake their defence. The Pope had taken advantage of the troubles of France to assert claims which had not been put forward even in the Middle Ages, and the

attempt failed. An Italian civilian alone defended him in the press, while the French pamphlets went to extreme lengths in assertion of the freedom and power of the kingdom. The death of Gregory XIV., and the elevation of Clement VIII., brought hopes of peace.

Something beyond a mere promise to be instructed was required from the king to be laid before his Holiness. On the other hand, Henry—or Du Plessis Mornay, the "Protestant Pope," who was acting on his behalf—considered it undignified to promise the result of the instruction before it had been given. The king, therefore, went so far as to promise that nothing would be omitted on his part to content the Pope, and that he took this engagement, not for selfish reasons, but to satisfy his subjects and establish peace, as he would make it appear in fact. With this message Cardinal Gondi set out for Rome, and there seemed good hope of accommodation, in spite of the efforts of the Court of Spain and its agents. We must needs feel great pity for the sincere members of the various parties to these negotiations. The Protestants could not be expected patiently to see their champion abjure their creed, which they believed him to share, and accept that of their persecutors; yet the benefits of this course were so plain that the very best of them, whether statesmen or divines, advised him to pursue it, and instructed him that he might be saved in the Church of Rome. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, could not credit his sincerity, and his letters to Protestant States, to Queen Elizabeth, and to Gabrielle d'Estrées, his mistress, constrain us to share their doubts. We

must hope that, though theological earnestness was wanting, desire for the peace of a great people may have been sufficient to take its place. Even the Pope must share our sympathy. The fear of offending Spain made it difficult to accede to a request which would disappoint all Philip's machinations, and by which the head of the Church was required to connive at a process of conversion which the easy humour of the king, and the jealousy of some Protestants, might represent as a farce. The proceedings at Rome were interesting examples of diplomacy, and Henry was well served by his representatives, De Gondi, Pisani, and Nemours, who showed wonderful patience, dexterity, and even spiritual earnestness, in pressing the reception of the returning prodigal. They all returned to France without obtaining what they sought for.

But it was in vain that the zealots of the pulpit and the agents of the king of Spain threatened eternal judgment upon those who treated with the king. In vain Mayenne protested that pure interest in religion had guided his action, and the legate called the adherents of Henry the slaves of a heretic. The States-General of the League were held at the Louvre, in January 1593. Even they displayed such jealousy of the legate that he was only admitted to speak on the express understanding that he claimed no voice deliberative or consultative. The clergy raised as usual the question of the publication of the decrees of Trent and that of elections; and the Archbishop of Lyons made a safe address, which enables us to see the *pro* and *con* of this important controversy. Elections, he

said, will give us capable abbots. The royal nominations of children, women, or persons of bad character have well-nigh ruined monastic discipline. On the other hand, it must be considered that as simony and corruption take place under the system of nomination, still greater may occur in elections, and that the governors of the towns will force the elections and procure the return of their candidates. Besides, the chapters now contain few capable persons, and the monasteries still fewer. The Bishop of Seulis replied on the ground of experience. Formerly, he said, he had been opposed to the plan of election. But his mind had been changed by observing that the prevailing system had destroyed in the monasteries both literature, piety, and devotion: witness the Cistercian order, whose houses were from this cause brought to absolute desolation; and that nominations to bishoprics cause as much contention as elections could do.

But this momentous question, as well as that of the publication of the Decrees of Trent, was shelved for the time on account of the still more absorbing matter of the election of a king. Philip II. was pressing for the nomination of his daughter, who was to be married, not to the Duke of Guise as the leaguers had hoped, but to an Austrian prince. The debate excited a Babel of contending ambitions which Henry proceeded to extinguish by holding, of his own motion, the meeting for his instruction in Catholic doctrine. It was conducted by the Archbishop of Bourges and the bishops of Nantes, le Mans and Chartres, the bishop elect of Evreux, and three curés of Paris

favourable to the cause of the king. The instruction began at six o'clock in the morning and continued till one o'clock in the day, and it is said that Henry showed himself an able controversialist, and did not yield without resistance. The three questions which he proposed to his instructors were, first, whether it was necessary as a Christian duty to pray to all the saints; the second referred to auricular confession, and the third to Papal authority. It was responded on the first point that it was enough to pray to our patron, but that in the litanies the whole Church together prayed to the saints in general, in order to unite all the petitions of the living and departed before God. On the second he was told that the just man accuses himself, and that a good Christian feels bound to acknowledge sins even where there may be none. The confessor has a right to ask questions where necessary. On the third it was explained that the Pope had supreme authority in spirituals, while he had nothing to do with temporal matters to the prejudice of kings and kingdoms. The words with which his majesty closed the discussion do not convince us of its serious reality. "You do not satisfy me as I desired," said he; "but, there—I place my soul in your hands. Take care of it, I beg; for where you make me enter there I shall remain till my death, and that I swear."

The legate thought himself bound to address to the Catholics of France a protest against the instruction of the king, but nobody paid attention to his objections, which were believed to be inspired by Spain. On Sunday the 25th July 1593, at nine o'clock in the

morning, the ceremony of abjuration took place at S. Denis. It was conducted with great ceremony. The king was magnificently attired, martial music resounded, the church was richly hung with tapestries, silks, and cloth of gold. The Cardinal Bourbon was present, with many bishops, and all the monks of S. Denis. The Archbishop of Bourges officiated, seated in front of the great door of the church. He asked, "What do you desire?" "To be received into the bosom of the Church Catholic Apostolic and Roman." Then the king made his profession. "I protest and swear, in the presence of Almighty God, to live and die in the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion, to protect and defend it against all persons at the peril of my life and my blood, renouncing all heresies contrary to the said Church Catholic Apostolic and Roman." The crowd and enthusiasm of the people was unbounded, and the brilliant ceremony wore the appropriate aspect of a public and political function rather than that of a thoughtful individual act of a soul before its Maker; but this did not prevent the king from carrying out the drama completely. He wrote a circular to the Parliaments to inform them that he had conferred with prelates and doctors on the points on which he desired to be enlightened, and after the grace which it pleased God to give him, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit which he had sought in prayer with all his heart, and satisfied by the proofs offered by these prelates and doctors out of the writings of the Apostles and doctors of the Church, recognising the Catholic Apostolic Roman Church to be the true Church of God, full of truth, and

which cannot err, he had embraced it, and was prepared to live and die in it. At the same time an address to the Protestants was issued, desiring them not to receive the news of this change of religion with any apprehension as to the maintenance of the Edicts of Toleration, or as to the affection which the king retained for his former associates. He had done it all for good reasons —first, his own salvation; second, in the desire not to be different from his ancestors; and, thirdly, because of the rebellions and tumults which threaten the State.

The zealots abated nothing of their violence, and it must be confessed that they were not without a specious reason when they doubted both the king's earnestness and the authority of the absolution which had been given to him. Various good stories were told of the witty sayings of the king upon so solemn a transaction, and an earnest controversy arose upon the right to absolve. The nature of it may be judged from the title of the most important work upon the subject. It was called, "Reasons by which it is shown that the bishops of France had the power of right to give absolution to Henry of Bourbon, king of France, from the excommunication by him incurred even for a case reserved to the apostolic see." The argument was that the bishops of the Church had, from primitive times, as well the cognisance as the absolution and reconciliation of heretics; and that if it be objected that by the bull *in cœna Domini*, the extravagant of Paul II., and the decree of Trent, the absolution for heresy is reserved to the Pope, the answer is that by the liberties

of the Gallican Church, the French are not obliged by the constitutions of the Pope unless they are received by the sovereign courts. This reasoning sufficed for the body of the French people, who were wearied of war and trouble, and anxious to welcome a king; much more one whose brilliant qualities, and even his very faults, ensured his popularity.

Paris opened its gates to him on March 22, 1594, and he was received with enthusiasm in every quarter of the city. The preachers disappeared. The Parliament of the League vanished quietly, and its memory only survived to be laughed at by readers of the *Satyre Menippée*. All the decrees registered during the dominion of the League were erased from the records. The Sorbonne made haste to wipe out its too famous decision. The doctors held a solemn assembly to make a declaration of loyalty and swear allegiance to the king. They notice the fact that some persons, badly instructed and prejudiced by sinister opinions, have maliciously attempted to sow scruples in men's minds, as if the king, having sincerely embraced the Catholic faith, was yet not to be obeyed, because the Pope had not yet publicly recognised him as eldest son of the Church; but the doctors are unanimously, without contradiction, convinced that Henry of Navarre is truly and legitimately the very Christian king, notwithstanding the opinions of certain factious enemies belonging to the party of Spain. The doctors therefore make oath to Henry, and expel from their body all those who refuse to do so. Of the members of the faculty who had given responses of so different a char-

acter, some made submission, but the larger number vanished from Paris. The Jesuits and the Capuchins were the only religious orders which refused to adhere to the declaration of the Sorbonne.

The University saw in the attitude of the Jesuits an opportunity to satisfy its ancient dislike. It resolved to indict the order. The Jesuits were alarmed for their safety, and sought the aid of Cardinal Bourbon-Vendome, who begged of Sully to espouse the cause of the company. Sully was a Protestant, but just and temperate, and well able to understand how imprudent any apparent retaliation upon the king's enemies might appear; but the University could not be prevented from presenting their petition to the Parliament. It accused the Jesuits of Spanish proclivities, of enmity to all order, both in the University and in the State, and of refusal to follow the late prescription of the theological faculty. The prayer of the petition is that the order of the Jesuits be expelled, not only from the University, but from the whole kingdom of France. That order presented a memorial to the Sorbonne imploring the theological faculty to sever itself from the action of the University, and was so far successful that the Sorbonne limited its demands to requiring submission to the University, but not expulsion from France. The Jesuits were supported before Parliament by this decision, and by a moderating letter procured by Sully from the king. The advocate of the University was the illustrious Antoine Arnauld, whose speech for the prosecution was a splendid effort, only blamable in its extreme bitterness, for he stigmatised the order as

thieves, corrupters of youth, assassins of kings, and sworn enemies of the State.

Another advocate was heard for the curés of Paris, who were all against the Jesuits, as usurpers of their rights, and of the favour of their parishioners. The company were described as numbering from nine to ten thousand. Their primary vow was one of blind obedience to their general, then always a Spaniard, and their houses were the centre of all movements in favour of Spain during the late troubles. Their principles of unlimited devotion to the Pope made them dangerous to kingdoms, and they had no title to establish themselves in France except the Act of Poissy, the conditions of which they had not kept. On the other side, it was urged that the Jesuits were willing to make submission to the king, that their expulsion would be a gross injury to the many noble persons who had built and endowed colleges for them, and to the Catholic religion, of which they were the chief defenders in the south of France. Other orders had been as vehement in the support of the League as they, and in the last general congregation of the order it had been resolved to cease occupying themselves with State affairs. For peace sake they were willing to submit themselves to the University. The Parliament gave no decision, and everything remained as it was.

But scarcely had they gained this triumph when an event occurred which brought down upon them a flood of popular hatred and the anger of the king. An attempt was made upon the life of Henry by a certain Châtel. The assassin displayed little resolution, and

the wound was slight; but the culprit, on inquiry, confessed that he had studied under the Jesuits, and learnt from them that the king was outside the Church, and ought not to be esteemed king until the Pope had approved him, and that it was a praiseworthy act to kill him. The college of the society was searched, and papers of a most compromising character were found, full of praise for the murder of Henry III., and encouragement to a like treatment of his successor. Guignard, a Jesuit Father, admitted the authorship of these productions. Châtel was executed with the horrible accompaniments usual at the time. Guignard was strangled in the Place de Greve, and the Jesuits were banished from France as corrupters of youth and enemies of the king and of the State; but this severe sentence upon a body of persons for the crime of a few was not wholly approved by lovers of justice, even though unfriendly to the society, and the Jesuits remained in those colleges of their order which were situated within the jurisdiction of the Parliaments of Toulouse and Bordeaux, and in some other parts of the kingdom besides. But the king approved the condemnation, and the Pope was reproached by many for keeping alive the fanaticism of extremists by his delay in giving absolution to the king.

In fact, the time for this concession had arrived. The king of Spain had withdrawn his opposition, and the absolution was determined; but the Pope was for imposing certain conditions founded upon the ultramontane belief in his power over the temporal affairs of kingdoms. The ambassador of France declared

positively that no such principle was recognised in France, and the conditions could not be accepted. Possible terms were at last devised, including a promise upon Henry's part to go to Mass every day, and to confess and communicate publicly four times a year. These being agreed to, the Papal absolution was granted, and a legate despatched to France in the person of Cardinal Alexander de Medici, a prudent diplomatist, who took with perfect calmness the condemnation by the Parliament of the ultramontane terms in which his letters of credence were couched, and secured from the king the restitution of all the advantages which the concordat had permitted to the Pope. But the clergy of France obtained none of the reforms which they desired, and remained dissatisfied, and so did the Protestants, who had as yet seen none of the benefits promised to them through Henry's conformity to the Roman faith. The negotiations and discussions on this matter were finally terminated by the issue, in the year 1598, of the memorable Edict of Nantes.[1] The substance of the ordinance which gave peace to France was as follows:—

A general amnesty for the past is provided, with restoration of all persons condemned for religion since the reign of Henry II. The Catholic religion is re-established everywhere, and restitution of property belonging to ecclesiastics is enforced. They are not to be molested in the exercise of their cult, nor in the reception of the tithe. Those of the so-called Reformed religion shall not preach in the churches or in

[1] Jervis, "Church of France," i. 205 *et seq.*

the dwellings of clergy. Protestants may dwell anywhere in France while observing the edict; noblemen possessing the highest feudal rights may have Protestant public worship in their houses; lords of less dignity possess the exercise of Protestant worship only for their family. Protestant worship shall be free wherever it existed in the years 1596 and 1597, and in those places named in the edict of 1577. Everywhere else the worship is prohibited; in the army it shall be held only where the commander is a Protestant. Protestants shall observe the holidays which are of obligation among Catholics; their books shall be printed and sold in the places where their worship is free; their scholars shall be received in universities, and their sick in hospitals; they shall observe the laws of the Roman Church as to consanguinity and marriage; they shall not be forced to take part in ceremonies, shall pay their tithes to the curé, shall be admissible to offices and dignities, and have separate cemeteries in towns. In every Parliament there shall be a separate Chamber of the Edict to decide on cases where Protestantism is involved. The children of refugees shall be received as French citizens if they return within ten years.

The edict was registered by the Parliament after considerable difficulty; neither did the Pope maintain any lengthened opposition. To complete the settlement, the cardinal legate negotiated peace between France and Spain, and the king proposed to marry Mary de Medicis, a relation of the mediator, the Pope having dissolved, without great difficulty, the marriage

with Marguerite de Valois, which had taken place at the fatal period of the S. Bartholomew. The lady herself approved the process, and certified that she had not given her free consent to the union.

We should hardly have expected to hear that Henry forced an unwilling Church and Parliament to restore the Jesuits.[1] Such, however, was the fact. Sully states that their restoration was intended to make amends for insults offered to the Pope and his religion in a fanatical meeting of Protestants; but a Jesuit named Coton had, at the same time, acquired influence with the king, and Henry proposed to the council the restoration of the society. Sully was deputed by the council to ascertain his majesty's wishes, and the two old friends had a familiar talk upon the subject. Sully represented the devotion of the order to Spain and Austria, and the blind submission which they paid to their general, which did not permit one to trust their promises. He believed them capable of arousing new wars, and of introducing to the court men who might take the king's life; but the king believed there was no choice now between a frank readmittal of the order to their former liberties and a total expulsion, which, involving the maintenance of a watchfulness against their plots, would make his life miserable. Sully replied that rather than see the king a prey to such fears, he would himself propose the restoration of the Jesuits. It was not effected, however, without a remonstrance from the Parliament, urged by the President de Harlay with such eloquence, well supported by his lofty religious

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, x. 531.

character, that the hearers believed it must prevail. But Henry maintained his purpose. He never trusted the society, and seems to have retained Père Coton at court as a hostage for his brethren, but the priest used his opportunities, and became the confessor and favourite preacher of the king. To have been confessor to Henry IV., and to have given him satisfaction, does not speak for the severe morality of the ecclesiastic.[1] His ability cannot have been of a very high order, for having taken it on him to exorcise a girl who was supposed to be possessed, he could not resist asking the evil spirit, before casting him out, a list of questions interesting to himself and his order. The list accidentally fell into unfriendly hands, and was published, to the high delight of the French public, which composed an abundance of those epigrams in which it has ever found consolation for the continuance of abuses more serious than the influence of Coton.

The assemblies of the clergy, amidst other grievances, were urgent at this period for a regulation of the *appel comme d'abus*, by which, under colour of abuses committed by the ecclesiastical authority, questions properly subject to the Church authorities were often drawn before the Parliaments.[2] One of the instances is interesting to liturgiogists. The Bishop of Angers had permitted the use of the Roman liturgy by some clergy in a particular church. Others who officiated

[1] Coton, however, gave an affecting account of the frequent passions of self-reproach and piety which his penitent experienced: too easy to believe.

[2] On the *appel comme d'abus*, or appeal from the ecclesiastical courts to the temporal, see Jervis, "Church of France," i. 76.

in the same church objected, and carried the case before the Parliament of Paris by an *appel comme d'abus*. The Parliament pronounced in their favour, and condemned the bishop for having made changes in the ancient liturgy of his diocese without the permission of the king. In the pleadings upon the case it was stated that in 1583 the Bishop of Paris had proposed to his chapter to adopt the Roman liturgy; but the chapter resisted the proposal on the ground that their own liturgy was very ancient and more perfect than the Roman, which, having been altered three times in a short period, did not offer the necessary pledge of stability; and the Sorbonne, being consulted on the point, was of the same mind as the chapter, and justified the consistency of a variety of uses with the unity of the Church. It is interesting to observe the resistance which was made to the introduction of the Roman rite, which has now expelled the ancient French uses, but not by any means through its superior merit or antiquity.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL.

Jesuit influence—Murder of Henry IV.—Revival in the Church of France—César de Bus—Cardinal de Berulle and the oratory—S. Francis de Sales—Mad. de Chantal—The Benedictines—Mère Angelique—Port Royal—St. Vincent de Paul—Sisters of Charity —Missions and retreats—Seminaries—Contests of the Jesuits.

THE latter part of the reign of Henry IV. is memorable in French Church history for the extension of the influence of the Jesuits, whose superior moral drill and *esprit de corps* endowed them with never-ceasing energy and mutual helpfulness. They possessed theologians of great learning, clever and experienced spiritual guides, and school teachers of the most approved methods, while their missions reached the most distant parts of the globe, and worked with unsurpassed self-denial and success. We cannot but inquire why it was that men of such power and devotion should have been not only detested by the mass of the people, but even suspected and disliked by the best and holiest whom the Church of France ever produced, and why the Jesuits returned the dislike of those who disapproved, and sometimes the benefits of those who did them good, by calumnies and injuries of which the order all over the world was made the agent. The answer may lie in the self-surrender to human masters which, if it improved their discipline, narrowed their sympathies and

impeded the responsibility of the conscience to God. We see in many other societies how indifferent both to self-interest and to all outside obligations members may become in their devotion to the body. If this may take place in unions formed for patriotic or philanthropic purposes, or even for those of crime, how much more may we expect it where religion had been the foundation of the vow, and where religion, even though shackled by the subjection under which it has been placed, still exercises its power in the name of the society over the soul.

The severest trial which the Jesuits had yet undergone followed upon the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravaillac in 1610. Père Coton displayed great grief upon the occasion, but he was heard to warn the murderer not to bring suspicion upon good people. It was proved that Ravaillac had been to confession with a Jesuit some time before the crime. Jesuit writers, among whom the Spaniard Mariana was conspicuous, had pronounced tyrannicide justifiable in certain cases.

Political reasons assisted the movement of feeling. The late king aimed at humbling the pretensions of Spain and Austria, and allied himself for that purpose with England and Germany. But Louis XIII. was but a boy, and his mother, Marie de Medicis, was regent. Her council was broadly constituted, but the real power lay with an Inner Cabinet, which contained an Italian named Concini, known as the Maréchal d'Ancre, and Père Coton. The tendency of this administration was altogether in favour of Spain.

It was declared in Parliament that Ravaillac had

claimed that his crime was in conformity with the doctrine of Jesuit writers. The Parliament directed that the faculty of theology should be summoned to confirm the approval which it had extended in the year 1413 to the decree of Constance against Jean Petit, while, for its own part, the Parliament condemned the book of Mariana, and ordered it to be burnt at the door of Nôtre Dame. At the same time, the Jesuits displayed that want of moderation which has been their general characteristic in success; their favour with the new government misled them. Père Coton made application to the Procureur-General to be allowed to print an apology for the Jesuits, to which nobody was to be permitted to make any answer, and some of their preachers advocated nothing less than a renewal of war with the Huguenots. They procured letters-patent from the regent permitting them to teach in their college of Clermont, but the University interfered, and called the cause before the Parliament, which, at the very same time, condemned Bellarmine's treatise of the power of the Sovereign Pontiff in things temporal.

Edmond Richer, grand master of the college of Cardinal Le Moine, was the chief opponent of Ultramontanism in those days. He had been a vehement leaguer, but worked his way to Gallican opinions through the study of Christian antiquity. The booksellers of Paris, having undertaken the publication of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, entrusted Richer with the task of editing the works of Gerson. Just at the time the treatises of Gerson were being used by the republic of Venice in opposition to the pretensions

of Paul V., and the editor of the great chancellor's works in France was marked as an opponent of Papalism. The controversies of the time, and the extreme violence with which he was attacked, prompted Richer to extract from his apology for Gerson a treatise which he entitled, "On the Ecclesiastical and Political Powers." This remarkable work argues that ecclesiastical authority belongs essentially to the whole Church. The Pope and the bishops are its ministers, and form the executive power instituted for that purpose by God. The Pope is the ministerial head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ is the Absolute Chief and Supreme Pastor. The Pope's primacy of jurisdiction does not confer on him the infallible power of making canons. That authority belongs to the universal Church, and to general councils which represent it. Richer suffered severely for his views, but his studies remained for his comfort, and he had no ambition.[1]

Meanwhile the case of the rights of the Jesuits to teach came before the Parliament, and Le Martiliére delivered a powerful plea against them, in which he maintained that the claim of absolute authority for the Pope formed the chief barrier to the reconciliation of separated bodies with the Church, and had brought about the destruction of her authority in many countries. The speech was published, and had an immense success, while the oration of Montholon, on the other side, obtained no circulation. The conclusion of the case was that the Jesuits declared in the registry of the Parliament that they would conform to the doctrine

[1] See Jervis, "Church of France," i. 274.

of the Sorbonne in what concerns the preservation of the person of kings, the maintenance of the royal authority, and the liberties of the Gallican Church, always observed in the kingdom. This declaration was signed by the most eminent Jesuits, including Père Sirmond and Fronto Ducæus; but as it was made without the advice of the Pope or the general, it meant on Jesuit principles little or nothing, and did not for a moment arrest the propagation of ultramontane opinions on the part of the society.

The Protestants showed strong distrust of the government, and no small disposition to renew the war if they had not been held back by Du Plessis Mornay and the Duke of Bouillon. A double alliance was made with the court of Spain by the marriage of Louis XIII. with Anne of Austria, and his sister with the Prince of Spain. The old counsellors of Henry IV. retired from court, and the party of Politico-Protestants was renewed under Condé and the Duc de Rohan.

The court was forced to summon the States-General, and that body met on October 27, 1614. The subject which occupied the ecclesiastical chamber was chiefly the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent. The chamber of nobles united themselves with that of the clergy to demand it. The Tiers-Etat determined to insert in its *cahier* a condemnation of tyrannicide containing a side-blow at ultramontanism. The king was requested to have it laid down as a fundamental law of the kingdom that, as he is recognised sovereign in his kingdom, holding the crown from God alone, there is no power on earth, whether spiritual or tem-

poral, which has any right over his kingdom, to deprive him thereof, or to dispense or absolve his subjects of the fidelity and obedience they owe, for any cause whatever. The Tiers-Etat persisted in this proposal, even against the wishes of the court itself, and the Parliament supported it.

In February 1615 the States presented their *cahiers*,[1] and the orator chosen to speak for the clergy was Armand du Plessis, Bishop of Luçon, known afterwards as the Cardinal Richelieu. He made an eloquent discourse concerning the miseries and abuses existing in the Church, among which absenteeism on the part of bishops obtained a full share of condemnation; but the careful exception which he made for the case of bishops whom the king required at court for the conduct of public affairs reveals to us the designs which already filled his mind. In the very next year he obtained his purpose, and was named Secretary of State. Upon occasion of the murder, by order of the king, of the Maréchal d'Ancre, Richelieu was displaced, and followed the queen-mother into her exile at Blois; but he returned as chief of the State, and, crushing his rivals in succession, acquired an influence over the king which nothing sufficed to shake. It was not the influence which flows from love, for Louis did not personally like him, but that which a strong mind exercises over a weak one. The aims of Richelieu were, the advancement of the power of France in Europe

[1] This was the last meeting of the States-General till 1789. On the constitutional defects of this assembly see Jervis, "Church of France," i. 283.

and the power of the monarchy in France. For neither purpose did the liberty of parties or of religions approve themselves to his mind.

The assembly of the clergy in 1615 chiefly insisted upon the publication of the decrees of Trent, and upon the re-establishment of Catholicism in Béarn in all its possessions and privileges. The Protestants were promised an indemnity for the Church goods which they were called to restore; but it was to be in the form of a charge on the royal domain, and placed them in the power of the king. This measure was in full accordance with the aims of Richelieu, who was determined to subjugate Protestantism as a power in the State; it was therefore carried. It was otherwise as to the Council of Trent. The usual answer was made by the king that its publication was desirable, but circumstances hindered it for the present. Thereupon the cardinals, dignitaries, and representatives unanimously declared themselves obliged by duty and conscience to receive the Council of Trent, promising to observe its decrees so far as their authority, pastoral and spiritual, enabled them, and, in order to a more formal reception, were of opinion that the provincial councils of the kingdom should be convoked in six months; but this action on the part of the clergy was very badly received by the court. The oration in which it was recommended to the king having been printed, the printer was fined, and the author put to his defence. Whatever recommendation of the decrees of Trent the number and importance of the assembly might give, did not at all amount to a promulgation of them in France according

to the laws of the kingdom. The provincial councils were never assembled.

The opening years of the seventeenth century were marked in the Church of France by splendid efforts at spiritual recuperation. The Jesuits did much, both in the sphere of learning and in the cure of souls, though their work was narrowed by their ultramontanism and their desire for rapid success. To this cause was due the doctrine of grace propounded by Molina, which corresponds to Arminianism. It was considered at Rome in the so-called Congregations de Auxiliis, and would have been certainly condemned had not the devoted services of the society to the cause of the Pope pleaded for them.

But it would be a vast mistake to suppose that the revival of spiritual efficiency in the Church of France, after the deadness which preceded the Reformation and the confusion of the wars of religion, was chiefly due to the Jesuits or to ultramontanism. Some of the leaders in the good work were absolutely at war with the society; and so exclusive and aggressive were the Jesuits, that we may count even those who merely worked apart from them as objects of their suspicion. The limits of this work do not permit us to treat at large of the revival. Its saintly character and Catholic stamp has happily drawn the attention of English writers to the movement, and many delightful works[1] exist to acquaint English churchmen with lives and

[1] See the "Revival of Priestly Life in France," the "Lives of S. Francis de Sales, Bossuet, and Fenelon," by Sydney Lear; and the "Life of S. Vincent de Paul" by Wilson (Rivingtons, now Longmans).

labours in which there is little that is not in perfect harmony with the principles of their own spiritual mother.

The earliest institution aiming at Catholic reformation was that of Priests of Christian Doctrine, founded before the end of the sixteenth century by César de Bus, who carried on his labours as preacher and catechist even after he had become blind. The final form which his work assumed was that of a simple aggregate of secular priests aiming at a more earnest discharge of their holy functions. To the same period belongs the Congregation des Filles de Nôtre Dame, established at Bordeaux by Jeanne de Estonnac, a niece of the famous Montaigne. The work spread rapidly, and by the end of the sixteenth century comprehended forty-seven sisterhoods in the west and south of France, intended for the education and training of young girls. Madame Acacie de Villemar was the instrument of propagating in France the work which S. Theresa executed in Spain by reforming the Carmelite order. With her was joined the saintly Cardinal de Berulle, one of the greatest benefactors to the Church of France, but in little favour with the Jesuits.

But the greatest work of De Berulle was "The Oratory of France," the idea of which is thus described by Bossuet: "De Berulle's immense love for the Church inspired him with the design to form a Company to which he desired to give no other spirit than the spirit of the Church itself, no other rules than its canons, no other superiors than its bishops, no other endowments than its charity, no other vows than those

of baptism and the priesthood." The disorders of the ecclesiastical state were such at the time that the simple desire to accept the obligations of the priesthood in a devoted spirit formed a sufficiently marked distinction for a new society. Its duties were parish work and teaching, but in the latter office it came into collision with the Jesuits, who were of opinion that the education of the youth of France belonged of right to them. The Oratorians were willing to work beside the other company, and the field was amply large for both, but the Jesuits showed extreme jealousy of the new congregation, and tried to injure it by unfair means. A letter from De Berulle to Richelieu is extant. It shows the high opinion which the author had of the efficiency of the Jesuits, since, without such an opinion, he could not have thrown so much into their hands as he declares himself to have done; but of their self-sufficiency and disregard for all who came in the way of their progress he has the sorest feeling. "Their own interest is their supreme law."

The work of S. Francis de Sales lay in Geneva, but he made several journeys to Paris and other centres of French life, and became known as a preacher or guide of souls, as one of the earliest spiritual writers in the French tongue, and a winner of converts from Protestantism. Alas! even he was tainted with persecution; but an affectionate nature, intense faith, with good sense and experience, rendered him an adviser of the first order, and his books have not lost any of their value or their charm. There were few of the great workers of his age who were not in friendship or cor-

respondence with the Bishop of Geneva, and some of them entrusted to him the spiritual guidance of their lives. To the latter class belonged Madame de Chantal, who, being left a widow, devoted herself to religion under the direction of the saint, and was chosen by him to conduct an enterprise which he had long at heart. It was the formation of a society of women devoted to works of charity. Madame de Chantal divested herself of her property in favour of her children, and, with two other ladies, commenced her holy work at Annecy. In the next year the three were professed, and a large number of others entered the community of the Visitation. It had been the first intention of S. Francis that the society should not be cloistered; but, by the advice of the Archbishop of Lyons, the plan was changed, and the constitution of the order drawn up by Francis was approved by Urban VIII. The convents of the Visitation were subjected to the ordinary, without any general superior. The first house was at Lyons. Several arose in succession in Southern France, and in 1619 Madame de Chantal established a convent in Paris.

Among all the reforms of the time, none were more important or interesting than those of the Benedictines, both men and women. The first author of the movement was Didier de la Cour, and its idea was simply that of a return to the primitive rule of S. Benedict. The reform spread widely in France, Germany, and the Low Countries, and was sanctioned by a brief of Clement VIII.; but S. Vannes, where Didier resided, was in Lorraine, which did not yet form part

of France, and it was determined to promote a reform on the same plan, but specially confined to France. Laurent Bénard, Prior of Cluny, was one of its chief authors. It was sanctioned by royal letters-patent and a Papal bull, and received its name from S. Maur, one of the first disciples of S. Benedict. The Benedictines of S. Maur received extraordinary honour from the authorities civil and ecclesiastical of every part of France, and no less than 180 abbeys and conventual priories accepted its rule.

The reform of the Benedictine nuns is of no less celebrity than that of the monks, but its history is of sadder memory. Mère Angelique Arnauld was its originator, and she commenced her work at Port Royal. She was the daughter of Antoine Arnauld, the advocate who pleaded so vigorously against the Jesuits. According to the bad custom of the time, she took the habit at eight years old, and was made abbess at eleven; but she was seventeen before the sermon of a Capuchin of indifferent character, preached in the chapel of her abbey, converted her to faith in the beauty of the religious life, and of the rule of S. Benedict. She renewed her vows, made a second profession, reformed her worldly habits, dressed in serge, abstained wholly from flesh meat, slept upon a paillass, and enclosed the convent within a stone wall instead of the former careless boundary of earth. Far more by example and prayer than by direct admonition, she drew her nuns to follow her ways, and in five years Port Royal was a strict model of Benedictine rule, to the great offence of many of the easy-tempered "religious" of the day;

but her example was widely influential, and her aid, and that of her nuns, was sought for the reform of many convents. Abbesses passed whole years at Port Royal to learn its methods, and many abbeys of men reformed themselves on the same model. An example of her difficulties, and of the public interest in her work, was afforded in the case of Maubuisson, the abbess of which was sister to the too famous Gabrielle d'Estrées, and of equally scandalous life. When Mère Angelique commenced the reform of Maubuisson this woman was placed in the house of the Filles Penitentes at Paris, but, escaping from thence, she presented herself at the convent with a number of young men. A door was opened for her by a nun, and the confessor of the house was in the plot. The reformed nuns were driven out, and silently trooped through the town until some of the rich inhabitants offered them shelter; but in three days the Parliament, on the application of the Abbot of Citeaux, granted a warrant, under which Madame d'Estrées was again shut up. The confessor was obliged to flee for refuge to the Jesuits of Pontoise, and Mère Angelique was left to carry out her work of reformation in peace.

There is no region in the world which is not full of the labours of S. Vincent de Paul, who did a work of philanthropy sufficient of itself to make him remembered for all time, in addition to a work of spiritual reformation both for laity and clergy which has not been confined to his own communion, but has spread its example and its methods far beyond. He had himself gone through the bitter experience of a slave

in Barbary. De Berulle discovered him in Paris hard at work in the hospitals, and procured him the post of curé of Clichy, and tutor in the family of the Comte de Joigny. There he began his work of missions and retreats. They were so successful that the Comtesse de Joigny and her husband provided the means for a house of priests whose work should be that of home missions. The experience of these efforts in various parts showed S. Vincent that the clergy needed his evangelistic offices as much as the people, and he began to hold retreats for candidates for ordination. The Bishop of Beauvais was the first prelate to see the importance of the design, and established a rule not to ordain any who had not made a retreat and listened to a course of instruction on the duties of the priesthood. He received his candidates in his own palace, and Vincent with his assistants directed the exercises. The Archbishop of Paris[1] followed, and fixed Vincent's College des Bons Enfants as the place of the retreat of ten days which he imposed upon his candidates. The expense of such engagements never deterred the saint, and ladies of rank were found to provide the means; Anne of Austria herself was among them.

Louise de Marillac, dame Legras, was the right hand of S. Vincent in the work of relieving the poor. Under his direction, she and other women like-minded with her visited throughout Paris and the neighbouring dioceses, quickening the zeal of associations of charity, teaching the best methods of nursing the

[1] It was at this period that Paris was constituted an archbishopric.

sick, granting medicines and alms; moreover, gathering the girls of the parishes to be taught their catechism, and instructed in religion. Vincent remarked as the work proceeded, that there were in every district women who neither seemed to have a call to the cloister nor yet to the married life, but were touched by the grace of God and the desire to be useful. And he saw that people of this sort would be able to render services to the sick which benevolent ladies, however well-disposed, could not perform. His conception of the life which he desired for them was the same which S. Francis de Sales had originally designed for the Sisters of the Visitation, though he had afterwards been persuaded to enclose them. It is, therefore, S. Vincent de Paul to whom belongs the praise in all the churches of founding the Congregation of Sisters of Charity.

The Congregation of the Mission had the same author. It was an association for visiting on a great scale. The Hotel Dieu was one of its chief cares, and the duty of visiting the sick in that great hospital became habitual and fashionable among great ladies. The unhappy convicts condemned to the galleys were another class who were close to the saint's heart, and for whom he received devoted help from good women. The institution of conferences for priests at work followed upon the retreats at ordination. And the priests who attended these gatherings at S. Lazare held missions for various classes—for artisans, for soldiers, for beggars. The retreats for ecclesiastics suggested retreats for laity, and such was the popularity of these,

that during the last twenty-five years of the saint's life it was computed that twenty thousand persons had made retreats at S. Lazare.

But S. Vincent had something in view of still more solid and permanent use for the work of the Church, namely, the establishment of seminaries for training students for the priesthood. In this work he had predecessors, De Berulle and Père Adrien Bourdoise. The last-named priest had been already authorised by the Archbishop of Paris to conduct a seminary, and after his example S. Vincent transformed his college of S. Lazare into a training place for the clerical life. Other houses of the same kind were opened in various parts of France, and many bishops confided to the "Lazarists" the government of their diocesan training colleges; but the chief source of the establishment and direction of seminaries was the College of S. Sulpice, which was founded by Jean-Jacques Olier, prompted to the work by Père de Condren.

Such were the various works of good by which the Church of France testified that, in spite of all her failures and defects, the Spirit of God and the example of Jesus were powerful in her. The Jesuits, as we have said, had little part in the works of revival which we have named; but not only did they labour at the same period in their work of education, they produced a saint—Jean-François Régis—who devoted his life to the work of an evangelist in France, since his superiors would not permit him to become a missionary in Japan. But we have the testimony of a plain-speaking book from among the Jesuits themselves to prove that they

were stricken with comparative sterility for abandoning the ways of their founders. The writer of this book was no other than the famous Mariana, author of those too famous sentences on tyrannicide which brought so great reproach upon his order. He writes in a spirit of enthusiastic love for the society; but he testifies to the existence of wide discontent among them. The method of government was too largely founded upon censures and reprimands, and too little upon confidence and encouragement. Espionage prevailed; quarrels were constant. The method of training had too many contemplations and retreats and too little of charitable work; and the source of all lay, according to the author's judgment, in the absolute monarchical rule which so strongly characterises the society. From this comes the indulgence extended to the faults of superiors who are the useful instruments of the autocracy, while subordinates are persecuted even to death; and in spite of the prevalent opinion of the capacity of Jesuits, this well-informed and competent writer is of opinion that it is ruled by mediocrity.

The society came into collision with Richelieu, because it had not sufficient confidence in his profound duplicity. In pursuing his double aim of placing the Protestants (as a political power) under the feet of the monarchy,[1] and humbling the House of Austria and Spain, he was obliged to take each object in its turn. The Jesuits and Ultramontanes were therefore scandalised to find him making peace with the Protestants,

[1] He crushed the Protestants politically, but did not persecute their religion.—Martin, *Hist. de France*, xi. 207.

unaware that when the time came to strike them no treaties would delay his action for a moment.

Again, the society came to open war with the Bishop of Poitiers upon the old question of the obligation to attend Mass in the parish church; but the bishop was a man of resolution, and in the most literal sense brought them to their knees to beg his forgiveness, which was granted them only on severe conditions.

A much more serious matter was their contest with the Bishop of Angoulême, in whose city they proceeded to establish a college, with all the rights of a university, upon the strength of a deed of agreement between the mayor and themselves, in which the bishop's consent was recited, though it had never been given. At Troyes, on the other hand, they attempted to establish themselves by the aid of a friendly bishop, pretending an eager desire of the inhabitants for their teaching, which the inhabitants repeatedly repudiated, and were successful in repelling the boon for which they were supposed to sigh. These enterprises on the part of the Jesuits were instances of the general design to set up rival establishments to the University of Paris, with equal powers of conferring degrees.

A certain work by Santarelli, an Italian member of the order, was published at Rome under the eyes of the Pope, and with the express approbation of the general of the Jesuits. The latter official devised the plan of sending two copies of the book into France for use among the friends of the order, in which some passages of a character likely to displease the French were not to be found. He had the indiscretion to communicate his

plan to the Pope, and received a severe admonition, and a promise that the volumes should be seized and suppressed by the Nuncio in Paris, which was done.[1] The work of Santarelli was censured by the Sorbonne, and the propositions which drew upon it this punishment were specified, in spite of the entreaties of the advocates of the order for a merely general condemnation. It taught that the Pope had power to punish kings with temporal chastisement, to deprive them of their thrones for heresy and other causes. It taught also that, though the Apostles had submitted to be subjects of secular princes, they were not so of right, and that, when the throne of the Sovereign Pontiff had been set up, princes became subject to him. These propositions were condemned by the Faculty, but the ultramontanes had not yet exhausted their resources. It had been the immemorial custom that each order of regulars should be represented in the assemblies of the Faculty by two doctors only. They attended in unlimited numbers for the purpose of revoking the censure on Santarelli. A constitutional dispute arose on this point, which the king thought to quash by forbidding any discussion on the power of kings; but the Jesuits persisted in seeking to revoke the censure, and appealed to Richelieu, to the great embarrassment of that minister, who was aware that the Pope disapproved of the proceedings of the Faculty, and equally aware that this body was but maintaining the accepted doctrine of

[1] Nevertheless, his plan has been adopted in other cases. Compare Dr. Troy's Bible, Dublin, 1816, with Macnamara's, Cork, 1818, and the editions of Keenan's Catechism before and after 1870.

the Church of France. The royal authority was again used to revoke the cause to the king: this done, no judges were appointed to try it, and the quarrel slumbered.

Richelieu was not afraid to face the anger of the Pope when occasion demanded, but he was at the moment desirous of procuring from his Holiness a cardinal's hat for his brother, in spite of a bull of Sixtus V. forbidding the elevation of two brothers to the dignity. He could not for such an end coerce the Sorbonne to accept ultramontane doctrine, but he had no objection to persecute the learned Richer, who, in his very last days, under the combined torture of the stone and the threats of Père Joseph, the inseparable associate of Richelieu, signed a retractation; leaving, however, to his friends a full account of the cruel circumstances under which it was extorted.

CHAPTER XVII.

JANSENISM.

Richelieu—Infringements of Papal claims—Abbé of S. Cyran replies to Père Sirmond—Imprisoned—The *Augustinus*—Bull of Urban VIII.—Port Royal—Jansenism—Arnauld's defence of Jansenius—On frequent Communion—On the meditations of Des Cartes—The Five Propositions.

THE power of Richelieu, strengthened by the taking of Rochelle and consequent destruction of Protestant independence, was confirmed for life on the Day of Dupes, when the queen-mother and Gaston of Orleans, the king's brother, supposed themselves to have obtained the dismissal of the minister. They were defeated, to their own bitter disappointment, and to the loss of the lives of a number of their adherents, sacrificed to the unsparing vengeance of the Churchman. Gaston, in search of allies throughout Europe, had married the daughter of the Duke of Lorraine, a union which brought him into direct connection with the interests opposed to the policy of Richelieu. The minister, on his restoration to autocracy, undertook no less a task than that of procuring from the assembled clergy of France a declaration of the nullity of the marriage; a more serious enterprise than that of our Henry VIII., seeing that no canonical impediment could be alleged.

Nevertheless it was done, on the ground that the civil contract is the matter of the sacrament of marriage;

that this contract, to be valid, must be in conformity with the law of the kingdom, and that the custom of the kingdom of France did not permit princes of the blood to marry without the consent of the king. Remembering the part which former Popes had taken in questions concerning royal marriages, it was a sign of the times that Urban VIII. should have been informed of the matter only by way of compliment, and for confirmation of a thing already sure. The Pope declared himself satisfied with the position assigned him, though he could not recognise the nullity of the marriage, and considered that the utmost that could rightly be done by the French State or Church was to declare the invalidity of the union in regard to its civil effects.

Another mediæval right of the Pope in France disappeared with the grant of a subvention from the clergy to the king without any demand for the consent of the Pope. The custom of seeking it had been long disused in France, and the abrogation was traced by Richelieu to a reaction against the bulls granted to Charles IX. for the absolute sale of Church property. The clergy of France showed likewise a desire to dispense with the interference of the Pope in the case of the censure of a book by Camus, Bishop of Belley. It was called *Le directeur spirituel disinterressé*, and the author claimed that it was composed after the spirit of his friend S. Francis de Sales. It contained sharp criticism of the monks and regular clergy, and they were eager for its condemnation at Rome; but the French secular clergy approved the doctrine, and were strongly attached to the author, whom they defended with success.

A still more eminent foe to the Jesuits was the learned and gallant Du Vergier de Hauranne, commonly known as the Abbé of S. Cyran. The honest intrepidity of this great man may be judged from the fact that he drew on himself the enmity of Richelieu by pronouncing against the opinion of the nullity of the royal marriage. From an early period of his student life the abbé had been closely associated with Jansenius, and the friends gave themselves to the study of S. Augustin. In Paris he met Mère Angelique, whose community had then fixed itself in the city, giving to their former abode the title of "Port Royal des Champs." After ten years of Christian friendship he became the director of the community.

His first work against the Jesuits was a refutation of the *Somme* of Père Garasse, their most popular writer, who sought to please by the method of buffoonery; but S. Cyran's second book uplifted his reputation to the highest. It was called forth by events in England, where the Archbishop of Chalcedon, who governed the English Roman Catholics by commission from the Pope, forbade regulars to hear confessions without licence from himself. The Jesuits, as usual, made resistance, and hence a quarrel in which the Abbé of S. Cyran interposed, under the *nom de plume* of Petrus Aurelius, for the defence of the rights of the hierarchy. He had the learned Jesuit Sirmond for an adversary, and, according to the futile custom of the period, an order from the king forbidding any one to speak on the subject in dispute was obtained. Père Sirmond broke this enforced peace, and the Abbé of S. Cyran made a

crushing reply, which received thankful recognition from the Roman Catholic clergy in England and from those of France in several successive assemblies.

These controversies, however, did not pass the usual limits of virulence which religious arguments at all times have been apt to reach; but a scandalous event which took place at Loudun throws a sadder light upon the state of the times. That city possessed a convent of Ursulines, certain members of which proclaimed themselves possessed by the devil, and accused Urbain Grandier, Curé of S. Pierre de Loudun, as the author of their affliction. The circumstances were remarked that one of the ladies afflicted was a relation of Cardinal Richelieu, that one of the minister's most unrelenting agents was at the time in Loudun, and that the accused priest had in old times disputed precedence with Richelieu on occasion of a public ceremony. It is hardly possible to ascribe to the great man the suggestion of the possession, which ordinary people of sense set down to mere folly, and which may have been due to hysteria; but it is unfortunately too consistent with his character to suppose that he may have availed himself of the opportunity to show that it was not safe to offend Richelieu. The victim was not of moral life, but Richelieu had little right to judge him upon this point, and the unhappy man bore the torture with resolution, and died at the stake with penitence and faith.

It is strange to read that such a man as Richelieu should fill the consecrated position of Abbot of Cluny. Such, however, was the fact, and, moreover, he was

elected by the unanimous voice of the Cistercian Chapter to the office of general of that order. The fact was that the Abbé Nivelle, general of the Cistercians, having failed in a well-meant attempt to reform the order, recommended upon his retirement that Richelieu should fill his place. He was said to be zealous for the reform of monasteries, and had it in his power to employ the royal authority with the obstinate; but the Pope refused to consent to the appointment, and inflicted upon the great cardinal a still severer rebuff, in declining to concede a cardinal's hat to Père Joseph, his faithful confidant. The policy of Richelieu was bent on the depression of the house of Austria and Spain, and whatever his tyrannies towards the Protestants at home, he never shrank from alliance with the Protestants abroad. It is no wonder that, in the critical times of the Thirty Years' War, such politics should be disagreeable to the Pope. He regarded Richelieu as the most formidable enemy of peace, and attempted to move him upon this point by a special mission entrusted to a young ecclesiastic named Mazarin. Mazarin saw greater advantage in ranging himself under the leadership of the great cardinal, whose policy he adopted, and even attempted to gain it friends in Italy. The Spaniards complained, and Mazarin was removed from Rome, but before leaving he made the Cardinal Antoine Barberini, one of the Pope's nephews, aware of the irritation of the French minister against Rome. This Cardinal, in reply, conveyed a hint that the Roman court would not be so ready to offer affronts if the French ambassador at Rome were more energetic.

Richelieu took the advice, and recalling the Count de Noailles, he sent the Maréchal d'Estrées, who replied to the many slights which were offered to him upon his arrival with more than equal vehemence and pride. Matters proceeded so far that d'Estrées was directed not to present himself at the Papal court, and that the nuncio in France was refused access to the royal audiences, and was treated with neglect by the French bishops at the command of the king. The choice of Mazarin to compose these differences suffices to show that the Pope feared their issue. There was reason. Some of the bishops of France had been pressing the assemblage of a national council to restrain the exaggerated pretensions of the Pope, and it was rumoured that Richelieu was the soul of this movement, and purposed to promote a schism with Rome. A French priest named Hersent published a work under the title *Optatus Gallus*, in which he maintained the imminence of a schism, and complained bitterly of the intention to erect a patriarchate in France. He did not name Richelieu, but it was easy to see that he was the intended patriarch.

There cannot be a doubt that many bishops openly maintained that the bulls of the Pope were not necessary for canonical institution to bishoprics. On this point the Abbé of S. Cyran was on the side of the Pope, and advised Mère Angelique that her brother, who had just been elected Bishop of Toul, would do wrong if he allowed Richelieu to persuade him to omit the ancient usage and law in the Church of France, of seeking bulls from the Holy See. The Abbé, as we

have seen, had already drawn on himself the displeasure of Richelieu by maintaining the validity of the marriage of Gaston of Orleans. Besides, he was known not to partake the opinions of the cardinal concerning attrition; a subject on which Richelieu (perhaps from interest in rating the requisites for valid repentance as low as possible) felt so strongly, that a priest already languished in prison for thinking differently from him on the point. And to crown all, a work from the pen of Jansenius appeared at the moment, in which the policy of Richelieu and his alliance with Protestants was strongly blamed. The work brought to Jansenius the bishopric of Ypres in the Low Countries; but it brought to his friend an imprisonment in Vincennes which lasted five years, and would probably have continued longer still but for the death of the implacable Richelieu.[1] The good man's papers were seized and searched. His correspondence with Jansenius got into the hands of the Jesuits, and was never returned, either to its owner or his representatives. His friend Vincent de Paul was examined with great strictness, and it was hoped that a desire to please Richelieu, whose patronage was of great use in his projects of charity, would have induced him to remember something favourable to the prosecution. Nothing was elicited; and yet the shameful imprisonment of one of the greatest scholars and noblest spirits in France was still continued, in the face of the Church which had repeatedly acknowledged the services of his pen, and

[1] Jervis, "Church of France," i. 371.

published at its own expense (though without knowing the name of the author) a splendid edition of his chief work. This edition had an extraordinary history. It was seized by royal order, and being stored in the loft of the chancellor's stable, was destroyed by the damp. It was reprinted, and the chancellor promised that it would not be seized again.

The administration of Richelieu was costly, and he was in constant need of money. The assemblies of the clergy were not found ready to assist him, and he determined to coerce them by a sweeping claim on the part of the king to all ecclesiastical property. On this ground a royal edict alienated a considerable amount of Church property; the very offence which Charles IX. could not commit without the connivance of the Pope, took place by the sole authority of the king. At the same time, by way of compensation for the royalties which had not been exacted for more than a century, the beneficed clergy were ordered to pay during two years one-sixth of their revenue. This large demand excited great opposition, and Richelieu was induced to forego it on a promise from the court-prelates that, if a national assembly were summoned, the Church would grant of its own free bounty the sum required, and more. With this hope the assembly was convoked, and after resorting to every species of threat, the cardinal contented himself with four millions instead of six.

A year after this assembly Richelieu was dead. He left the kingdom much impoverished by his wars, and the misery of the peasantry was extreme. But

he had prepared the way for the splendid reign of Louis XIV.; in the further distance, also, for the Revolution at home, and the hatred and revenge of all foreign nations.[1]

France hoped for a change of policy, but Anne of Austria set Mazarin in the place of his brother-cardinal and instructor. The war of the Fronde was the protest of the nobles and Parliaments of France against the rule of an Italian, but our attention is claimed for a spiritual contest, more important, and certainly much more earnest, than the frivolous civil broil of the time.

Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, died of the plague in 1636, but left ready for the press the *Augustinus*, which had been the great work of his life. This exhaustive study of the principles of grace was meant to

[1] The Political Will and Testament of Richelieu was published in 1688, and I have before me an English translation of 1695. (Upon its genuineness see the note to vol. xi. of Martin's *Histoire de France.*) Part I., sec. 1, describes the former evil condition of the clergy. Sec. 4 bears testimony to the partial extent of the right of the Regale over the dioceses of France, and thereby displays the gross injustice of the quarrel of Louis XIV. with the bishops of Languedoc and the Pope, as hereafter to be related. Sec. 6 gives a graphic description of the extent to which exemption from episcopal authority prevailed, and of the mischief which it caused. Sec. 7 describes the evil of lay presentations, which, arising in times when lay founders were pious, are maintained in times when their descendants are irreligious and corrupt. In the same section the great minister bears witness to the fairness of mind prevailing among Gallican theologians. "I may declare with truth that I have ever found the doctors of the University of Paris, and the most learned monks of all orders, so reasonable on this subject that I have never observed the least weakness in them that could hinder them from defending the just rights of this kingdom; neither have I observed any affection in them towards their native country which could induce them, contrary to the true sentiments of religion, to diminish those of the Church to augment the others."

supply a remedy for the Pelagian and semi-Pelagian teaching of the Jesuits, who, in their eagerness after earthly success for themselves and for the Pope, were too apt to conform the doctrine of heaven to the demands of the world. A treatise, drawing a parallel between the teaching of the Jesuits and that of the semi-Pelagians, was appended to the larger work, and gave point to its intention. The friends of the author determined to print with the utmost speed and secrecy, in order to anticipate any impediments on the part of the Jesuits, but the society obtained the sheets of the book by the agency of a workman. Their interest, both in Louvain and Rome, was employed, and an injunction from the University forbade the printer to proceed; but, by presenting a demand to be heard against an order so injurious to him, the printer obtained sufficient time to complete the book, and it was sent out into the world. The Abbé of S. Cyran saw through the press the French edition of the work of his friend.

It was met, as we might expect, by violent accusations of Calvinism, and the Inquisition of Rome condemned it on the ground that the Pope had forbidden the discussion of questions of grace. The Jesuits were content to see several works of their own, as well as of their adversaries, condemned on this common but childish ground. Such a decision did not arrest the battle for a moment; but the advocates of the *Augustinus* claimed a pronouncement from the Pope on the question whether the doctrine of Jansenius was really such as was imputed by his enemies, the author

himself, in his preface, having submitted his book to the judgment of the Holy See.

Some doctors of the Sorbonne were sounded by the nuncio upon their dispositions, and Richelieu would have gladly seen a condemnation of the work by the Faculty, but its wisest heads were disinclined to touch the question. So long as Richelieu lived there was little open discussion. Opinion was in favour of Jansenius, but it was dangerous to pronounce, even on recondite subjects, against the judgment of the minister. His death liberated pens and tongues. The nuncio did not find great effect from commands issued by the king and the Archbishop of Paris to avoid the subject in sermons. The archbishop, indeed, seems to have repented of his order, and warned the nuncio that the censure of the Inquisition at Rome would be more likely to dispose the minds of Frenchmen in favour of the book than against it. The nuncio therefore urged that his Holiness should himself issue a bull.

A bull then was issued by Urban VIII. in 1642, containing a general condemnation of the *Augustinus*. The first copies of this document reached France through Flanders, and the opponents of the Jesuits accused them of forging it. When it was circulated by the nuncio, it was objected at the council that letters-patent from the king were required for its publication. The nuncio replied that it was intolerable that such authority should be required for a bull having reference only to matters of faith. The bull, however, was not published with the usual formalities; nor was

any order issued to dispense with them. Yet certain bishops, aware of the desire of the regent, promulgated it in their dioceses.

Meanwhile Port Royal des Champs, which the community of Mère Angelique had left vacant on removing to Paris, was occupied by a brotherhood who have given it a world-wide reputation. S. Cyran designed their community as a counterpoise to Jesuitism. It was their aim to unite the asceticism of early ages with the highest thinking of the moderns. The first to embrace the life was Le Maistre, grandson, by his mother, of Antoine Arnauld, and himself the most brilliant advocate of his day. At the age of thirty, moved by the ministrations of the Abbé of S. Cyran at the death-bed of a relative, he renounced the foremost position at the bar of France to retire from the world, like the monks of the Thebaid. Presently the company of Port Royal numbered the great names of the doctor Antoine Arnauld, of De Sacy, Pascal, Nicole, Tillemont, with many others less known in our country, but of high repute in their own.

The doctor Arnauld was the most prominent figure in the controversies of his own time. He was the twentieth child of the famous advocate who pleaded against the Jesuits, and heir to the enmity of the order. The thesis which he produced at the University for his bachelor's degree was an exposition of S. Augustine's doctrine on grace. The *Augustinus* had not yet appeared, and the subject shows the bent of the student's mind, and the effect of his close intercourse with the Abbé of S. Cyran. That saintly man took a great interest in the

community of Port Royal; but he did not long survive his liberation from Vincennes, and died in October 1643. Arnauld defended the doctrine of his master, and took the place in the Jansenist controversy which the Abbé of S. Cyran would doubtless have filled if he had lived. He vehemently attacked the bull of Urban VIII., refusing to believe it genuine, and answered the attacks of the Jesuits by an Apology for Jansenius.

A particular case served to set in contrast the moral principles of the Jesuits and those of Port Royal. A certain Princess de Rohan Guémené had been converted from a life worse than frivolous by the agency of Arnauld d'Andilly, and placed herself under the direction of the Abbé of S. Cyran. It will not be thought strange that the new director was strict in forbidding his penitent to indulge in worldly amusements which had led her into sin, and influencing her to decline an invitation to a ball on a day on which she had communicated. But a Jesuit who had confessed her during her time of laxity had encouraged her even then to attend the Sacrament, and now, with two other fathers, he sent her an elaborate letter casting doubt upon the wisdom of the Abbé's treatment, and laying down this maxim, "The more devoid of grace one is, the more should one boldly approach Jesus Christ in the Eucharist: people full of self-love and attached to the world do well to communicate very often." The princess showed the letter to the Abbé, who charged Doctor Arnauld to reply to it, and this was the origin of the book on "Frequent Communion," written in 1641, but not published until two years later. It states the question,

"Is it more useful for souls guilty of mortal sins to communicate immediately after confession, or take some time to purify themselves by penitence before approaching the altar." Arnauld was able to show, by an overwhelming amount of testimony, that the latter method comes far more near to the practice of the primitive Church. He was not forgetful of the change of times, nor yet of the fact that to abstain from frequent communion on pretence of a pious dread would be an extreme mistake; but just as in the early Church to defer baptism was approved if it had the intention of better preparation, but disapproved if it was for the sake of avoiding the responsibility of receiving a great grace, so it is with Holy Communion.

This question enables us to see what was the principle of the general contest. The Jesuits were impatient of a religion so strict in its demands as to confine its promises to a few, while the Port Royalists were impatient of a reduction of the demands of religion which might fill the Church at the price of lowering the Christian standard; and the same principle is to be observed in the disputes regarding grace. The Jesuit doctrine tends to expel mystery from our religious life, and to ignore those disabilities which urge us to ascribe everything good to another than ourselves, while the Jansenist acknowledges the mystery, but may easily narrow the operation of grace, and discourage the sinner with the thought that he has no part or lot in religion. But the two tendencies must always exist. Nobody ought to surrender himself wholly to either; no Church ought to restrain the ex-

pression of either truth, since they are both taught in Scripture. General conclusions are difficult upon points in which it is not possible to say anything that is true in every sense. There is little utility in discussing such matters in heated arguments, and before earthly tribunals.

Arnauld did not publish his book until he had secured perusal and approbation from four archbishops, twelve bishops, and twenty doctors in theology. Nevertheless, the Jesuits assailed it from the pulpit with a violence almost incredible. They demanded the help of the royal sword against the monster of our day, and professed to apprehend the destruction of the monarchy as an effect of the maxims of the book on "Frequent Communion." But they were unable to consign Arnauld to the Bastille, and determined, as the next best thing, to despatch him to Rome, that he might defend his book before the Inquisition. Arnauld was aware of what his enemies were capable, and retired into a studious concealment which lasted for twenty-five years. After immense exertion the Jesuits failed in obtaining a condemnation of the book at Rome. They assuredly would have procured it had not the bishops who approved the book sent theologians to Rome to prevent it. Before these envoys arrived one sentence of the preface had incurred censure. The words were due to De Barcos, the new Abbé of S. Cyran, and nephew to his predecessor in the office, and they said of SS. Peter and Paul that they "were two chiefs who made but one."[1] The two Apostles

[1] Jervis, "Church of France," i. 398.

were regarded in primitive times as the founders of the Roman Church, and the phrase of De Barcos would appear to mean that the double succession was concentrated in the Pope; while the denial of it seems to reject the primitive tradition, and throw the whole weight of Papal supremacy upon the Petrine succession, ill able to bear such a burden. The sense in which the proposition was condemned was that of establishing an entire equality between S. Peter and S. Paul. De Barcos denied that this was his meaning. We may perhaps consider that even in this sense they do not overpass the claims of authority which S. Paul himself sets up. With this small victory the Jesuits had to rest content. Pope Innocent X. was now upon the throne. Great pressure was exerted to induce him to urge the reception in France of his predecessor's bull against Jansenius, but the Pope ventured no more than a brief to the Sorbonne, which was reverently received, but had no effect.

At this time the "Meditations" of Des Cartes made their appearance; the prelude, and in no small degree the instrument, of methods of thinking destined to confine authority within narrowed limits, and to compel it to justify itself by better reasoned arguments than of old. Arnauld proved his sense of the importance of the book by an able criticism of it. This work, together with the *Perpetuité de la Foi*, the *Principes de la Foi Chretienne*, and above all, the *Pensées* of Pascal, suffice to show that Port Royal recognised philosophy as the ablest friend or deadliest foe of faith, and were

prepared to deal with it by those methods of unfettered thinking which alone avail.

The history of the Jansenist controversy is centred in the fortunes of the far-famed Five Propositions. They were formulated by Dr. Nicolas Cornet, who proposed them for condemnation to the Faculty of Theology on July 1, 1649,[1] and were originally seven, but the two last sank into oblivion. The five propositions were as follows:—1. Some commandments of God are impossible for just men who desire to observe them, and who put forth for that purpose all their force, according to the powers which they possess in the present state: they require, in addition, the grace which would render them possible. 2. In the state of fallen nature an interior grace is never resisted. 3. In the state of fallen nature man has no need, for merit or demerit, of a liberty exempt from necessity; it is enough if he possesses a liberty exempt from constraint. 4. The semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of an internal prevenient grace for all acts, even for the commencement of faith, and they were heretics because they believed that this grace was such that the human will was able either to resist or obey it. 5. It is a semi-Pelagian error to say that Christ died, or that He shed His blood, for all men absolutely.

It is to be remarked that these propositions were at first laid before the Faculty without any mention whatever of the name of Jansenius. Cornet answered the objection that he was introducing prohibited questions

[1] Jervis, Church of France, i. 401 *et seq.*

by a solemn declaration that there was no question of Jansenius. On this understanding, which contrasts strangely with the persuasion which afterwards became a kind of article of faith, the motion of Cornet was considered.

Another doctor carried a proposal to refer some propositions from the Jesuit teaching for examination, notably this, that natural attrition suffices for the sacrament of penance; but these, together with Cornet's two last, were neglected, and we hear no more of them. The mass of doctors of the regular orders secured the adoption of the proposal that the propositions should be examined. The Faculty, however, came to the conclusion that its existing decrees were sufficient for the necessities of the case; nor did Rome show greater forwardness in condemnation. It was therefore thought necessary to stimulate the Holy See by a demand on the part of the clergy of France for censure upon the propositions. The general assembly was then in session; but the promoters of the censure were afraid to bring their demand before it, and the letter forwarded to Rome, though nominally emanating from the body of the French Church, was but a composition of the Bishop of Vabres, signed at private solicitation by eighty or ninety persons of eminence, among whom was Vincent de Paul. The letter takes for granted the connection of the Five Propositions with the work of Jansenius, in contradiction to the declaration of Cornet, their author, that there was no question in them of Jansenius at all. It also assumes the still more important point that the propositions are not to be taken

in the sense of S. Augustine or S. Paul himself, but in that of Calvin.

The letter was followed to Rome by another from eleven influential bishops, which begged his Holiness not to take its predecessor as an utterance of the clergy of France; and requested him either to let this controversy on grace, which had existed so long in the Church, to continue without interference a little longer, or else to decide it with all due forms of procedure. Well might they say that the controversy had continued long: they might have added that it will continue always, and that his Holiness could not stop it. Such controversies as that of S. Augustine with the Pelagians, or even the English Calvinists with their opponents, may bring some light to inquiring minds, because they were free; but the Jansenist controversy, because it was carried on under external authority, was degraded into a war of parties and court favour and jealous intrigue; and we read it now, not as helpful to thought or inquiry, but as a sad record of very secular history.

In 1648 the community of nuns of Port Royal had become so numerous that a portion of them under Mère Angelique returned to Port Royal des Champs, and the recluses who had occupied that building retired to a house in the neighbourhood called les Granges. They were the object of many calumnies, but it seemed that God took their part when Mademoiselle Perier, the niece of Pascal, was cured of a disorder in the eyes by the touch of a thorn from the crown of the Lord. Few of us will believe in the genuineness of the relic:

as to the fact of the cure, we must leave it to examination with those at the tomb of the Abbé Paris and at Lourdes; Jansenist and Ultramontane together. Madlle. Perier's recovery was verified, at the desire of the queen-mother, by Felix, first surgeon to the king.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WAR OF THE FIVE PROPOSITIONS.

The Propositions condemned at Rome - Are they in Jansenius?—Persecutions of Port Royal and Arnauld—The "Provincial Letters"—Bull of Alexander VII.—Expulsion of nuns from Port Royal—The four bishops — Pacification of Clement IX. — Theological activity.

THE king was now past his boyhood, and began to have a will and judgment of his own; but in the matter of Jansenism he never had an open mind, and placed himself from the first at the entire disposal of his Jesuit confessor P. Amiat. His interest was used at Rome to hasten a decision upon the Five Propositions; but the representatives of the eleven bishops urged the necessity of hearing both parties in open court. The demand was so reasonable that they were allowed to speak before the Pope, were patiently heard, and highly complimented; but their opponents were not present and never met them in argument. In the course of their address they exhibited a table, on which were presented, in three columns, first, the Calvinistic and censurable sense of each of the Five Propositions; secondly, the orthodox Augustinian meaning in which each might be understood; and thirdly, the opinion of Molina and the Jesuit school upon the point in question.

But this solemn argument would seem to have been little more than a form. One pleasant June evening

they received the news that a bull in condemnation of the propositions was posted at the gate of S. Peter's. On going to read it, they found it already removed, but were convinced that it had been issued; and such was the fact. The bull *cum occasione* condemns the Five Propositions, and imputes them indirectly to Jansenius by its concluding words, "We do not intend by this declaration and definition on the above five propositions to approve in any way the other opinions contained in the above-named book of Cornelius Jansenius." But the Pope himself cannot have thought that this was dogmatically laid down, when he wrote to the Bishop of Tulle that they "seemed to be drawn from the book of Jansenius."

All submitted to the authority of the Pope. But Arnauld and the Port Royalists, and many others, with some bishops among them, maintained that the propositions condemned were not in Jansenius. Arnauld was never answered by the simple production of the words from the book of Jansenius. It is true that an honest and capable reader may consider the propositions to follow inevitably from Jansenius' principles. This is proved by the fact that Bossuet believed it. But if questions on the interpretation of wills were decided in the law courts on such principles all property would be insecure. The bull, however, was accepted, and the Jesuits made the pulpits resound with their triumph, and with their denunciations of Port Royal. This was the time of the great rebellion in England, and it was a usual thing to accuse these peaceful students of propagating the principles of

Cromwell. This charge procured for Port Royal some visits of the police. Nothing was found but a few ascetic recluses and some children under their teaching.

The Abbé Olier, one of the most earnest priests in France, thought himself bound to support a brother clergyman in refusing absolution to the Duc de Liancourt, except on condition of removing his little daughter from the school of the nuns of Port Royal, and sending away the Jansenist clergy whom he entertained in his house.[1] Arnauld forwarded to Alexander VII., the new Pope, a tract in which he protested against such unauthorised excommunications. The Pope intimated, in conversation with the French ambassador, that the curé was in the wrong, and remarked to the Jesuits, that while they desired to expel these men from the Church, he desired to retain them.

The Pontiff was soon induced to swim with the stream. But Arnauld sent to him his next contribution to the controversy, in which he wrote that "Scripture shows us in the person of S. Peter an instance of a good man to whom grace, without which man can do nothing, was wanting on an occasion on which no one can deny that he sinned." The phrase was taken from S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine, and is perfectly capable of a true sense. But it is also capable of being understood to make God the author of S. Peter's sin, and in this sense it was well fitted for the use of Arnauld's enemies, who pushed their advantage so far as to carry in the Theological Faculty, chiefly by

[1] Jervis, Church of France, i. 422.

the votes of the monks, a condemnation of Arnauld both as to fact and doctrine. He was deprived of his doctorate by the Faculty, and sixty other doctors submitted to expulsion with him. He was likewise deprived of his membership of the Sorbonne. And the Jesuits, who had so long regarded the University with jealousy, were enabled to congratulate themselves on rending it asunder.

They had, however, gained the assistance of the Dominican doctors, pledged followers of S. Thomas Aquinas, by the invention of certain phrases capable of various meanings, such as *Pouvoir prochaine* and *Grace suffisante.* This was a device worthy of cunning persons of mediocre ability, but it had its ludicrous side, and it happened that it was watched by a great genius who possessed in an unequalled measure the powers of a religious satirist to touch irresistibly the sense of humour without ever losing the tone of an indignant friend of truth and goodness. The above-named diplomatic expressions form the subject of the opening pages of Pascal's "Provincial Letters."[1]

To gain the laughers to the side of severe and mysterious doctrine might seem no easy task, but it was executed, and the author, having learnt his power, proceeded to use it in the kindred sphere of morals. There also the Jesuits might have hoped to retain the world on their side, since it was to accommodate the world that their relaxations of Christian morality were

[1] Pascal and his sister after all discovered, while the rest of the party denied, that it is impossible to concede the Pope's infallibility in doctrine without giving him infallibility in facts ; nor to deny the latter without denying the former. Jervis, Church of France, i. 443.

devised. They had founded a new school of right and wrong, and produced a whole cloud of manuals of casuistry, enabling the director of conscience to make things easy for those who will not be religious except on the condition of being worldly at the same time. We must take care not to be unjust to casuists. Their calling is of great value if truly practised, and it is unfair to treat their instructions for the treatment of spiritual disease as if they were text-books for education; but it is rightly demanded of physicians that their medicines for the sick should leave no bad effects upon the patient when restored to health. The ancient discipline of the Church aimed at curing sinners of their spiritual diseases. The penitent of the Jesuits could never again be healthy or strong. The indictments of Pascal were not only read by the world, but produced a serious effect upon the religious authorities. The curés of Paris demanded from the assembly of 1656 a commission to examine into the charges. The proposal failed of its due effect because Paris was at the time without an archbishop, the disreputable Cardinal de Retz being an exile for his political conduct. But the curés, with those of other dioceses, succeeded so far as to have the "Instructions" of S. Charles Borromeo circulated among the priesthood as a counterpoise to the Jesuit manuals; and the Jesuits suffered another humiliation in the censure affixed by the Faculty of Theology upon a book by F. Pirot, entitled an "Apology for the Casuists," which was, in fact, a repetition of their offence.

A new colour was given to the Jansenist controversy

by the bull of Alexander VII., October 16, 1656, which confirms that of his predecessor, and declares that the Five Propositions are drawn from the *Augustinus* of Jansenius. The bull was registered, and the king addressed an order to the Parliaments that the clergy must sign it as a formulary within a month. It was no longer possible to maintain that Rome had not condemned Jansenius. His adherents stood face to face with the difficulty, which has so often presented itself to searchers after truth, What is to be done when your highest religious authority declares as a fact that which you know to be not a fact? Arnauld produced a tractate upon the three cases of conscience which the crisis raised. First, is a doctor who has been hitherto persuaded that the Five Propositions are not in the book of Jansenius, and were not condemned in the sense of that author, obliged to change his opinion after the Papal bulls? Arnauld replies in the negative. The question whether the propositions are in Jansenius is one of *fact*, regarding which the Church is not infallible. The second question is whether the said doctor can sign the formulary? Arnauld again replies in the negative: the doctor in question could not sign without wounding his conscience as a Christian and a priest. The third question is whether the doctor can keep silence on the subject, and again he answers, under present circumstances, No. This pamphlet was addressed to the saintly Pavillon, Bishop of Aleth, who, for the time, thought differently from the author, and held that the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff should prevail over our private opinion. The Port

Royalists did not maintain the obligation of speaking, but offered a condemnation of the propositions, wherever found, together with a promise of respect and silence upon the question of fact.

Their terms were rejected, and though the Port Royalists were victorious in the literary conflict, they were not able to overcome the force of the royal orders which their enemies held at their disposal. The Faculty of Theology, which had expelled from its number all the friends of Arnauld, made no objection to subscribing the formulary. Most of the bishops yielded obedience to the king. The vicars-general of Paris attempted to introduce a modification by which the question of fact was excepted from the declaration, but the king annulled it. The vicars-general had recourse to the Pope, who rejected their appeal, and they then published a mandate requiring pure and simple adherence to the constitutions of Innocent X. and Alexander VII.

This touched the Port Royalists as residents in the diocese of Paris. It so happened that at this moment Cardinal de Retz came to an arrangement with the court. He surrendered (for good compensation) the see of Paris. His successor died soon after his appointment, and was replaced by Hardouin de Pérefixe, a man of many good qualities, but very submissive to the court. This prelate devised a system of his own for helping consciences in the great difficulty of the time.[1] According to him, divine faith was not exacted for the fact that the propositions were in Jansenius. Divine faith is for revealed facts; but for facts such as

[1] Jervis, Church of France, i. 462 *et seq.*

that in question, which are not the subject of revelation, a human faith is sufficient, yielding to the testimony of the Pope and the bishops as witnesses. The distinction does not possess much value in a question of earthly fact, but it cleared the Port Royalists of the accusation of heresy, which could not be imputed for refusing to believe human testimony. Immediately upon issuing the mandate which contained this provision, the archbishop made a visit to the convent of Port Royal, and signified his high approval of everything he found, except the refusal of a signature pure and simple to the formulary. They replied that their sole reason for refusing was the fear to lie to God by affirming a fact which they did not know. Delay was given, but the refusal was maintained, and the archbishop pronounced them pure as angels, but proud as demons. A final visit followed, in which the prelate was accompanied by a body of soldiers. Twelve nuns were forcibly removed, and the direction of the community was committed to six nuns of the Visitation. The nuns of Port Royal des Champs presented to the archbishop a paper in which it was easy to trace the hand of Arnauld, for, with great simplicity of style, it exposed the various defects which so plainly belong to the distinction of divine and human faith as to matters of fact. To answer it the archbishop availed himself of the pen of Bossuet, who made his first literary appearance in connection with these transactions.

Bossuet displayed his characteristic ability and largeness of heart in dealing with these pious and intelligent women. However, there was no true way of dealing

with them except the way which the Church of England would probably have taken, namely, that of letting them alone; but such a course was not suitable for a Church proud of her perfect discipline. When Bossuet explained that their kind bishop did not ask for the same adherence to the fact alleged in the Papal bull as to the revelations of the Christian religion, that he but required a sincere submission of their judgment to that of their lawful superiors—an affair of humility, not of understanding—what was the meaning of it all except the distinction between the question of doctrine and of fact which the Port Royalists asked leave to draw? But the great Bossuet was all his life essentially of the same opinion which he evinced at this early period. He condemned Jansenism, and believed that it included the Five Propositions. But he never exaggerated the importance of the question, nor suspected Jansenism everywhere. He even retained the sincerest friendship and admiration for such men as Arnauld and Quesnel, and Port Royalists always regarded his teaching and preaching on the subject of the grace of God as an exact expression of their belief.

But others were found to fight the battle more effectively, though not more courageously, than the sisters. Among the bishops, Pavillon of Aleth led the way. To accept at the bidding of the king a formulary of faith drawn up by an assembly of the French clergy, embodying a prescription of the Pope upon a matter where the Pope had no right to prescribe, and to call upon ecclesiastics to sign this formula before the civil power—all this seemed to the good Pavillon a com-

bination of defiances to the ancient laws of the Church. He accordingly proceeded to excommunicate those of his clergy who, against his direction, had signed the formula before the civil magistrate.

The king was angered, and an indictment of Pavillon followed, in which the advocate-general went to lengths, in the exaltation of the royal power in ecclesiastical matters, which offended the best members of his own party. Even those who disapproved the distinction of doctrine and fact, and ascribed to the Pope infallibility of both kinds, were yet sensible that to make the civil power the medium by which Papal decrees were imposed upon ecclesiastics was not according to the tradition of the Church. The Pope was therefore urged either to make the action of the king and the assembly his own, or himself to issue a formula for the signature of the clergy. The Pope replied by issuing three briefs, but this proceeding was found inconsistent with precedent, and in February 1665 Alexander VII. issued a bull and a formula for signature, in which no mention is made of the distinction of doctrine and fact, and uniform submission is demanded upon the whole question.[1] The bull was registered; and thus the distinction of a human and divine faith, as made by Archbishop Pérefixe, was put out of court equally with that between law and fact as drawn by Arnauld.

Several French bishops accompanied their signature of the form and their imposition of it upon their clergy by intimations of one species or other that they still retained the obnoxious distinction; but four, those of

[1] Jervis, Church of France, i. 465.

Aleth, Beauvais, Angers, and Pamiers, issued mandates in which the limitation of their assent was stated and defended. "The Church," said the Bishop of Aleth, "demands submission of the reason as to revealed truths. When it renders testimony to the revealed truth of which it is the guardian by condemning a proposition as heretical, its judgment should subdue all doubts; in this consists an act of divine faith: but when it judges that these heretical propositions are in a certain book, it cannot claim our internal assent. Respect, deference, and silence are all that it can demand."

The king was much irritated by these signs of independence, and demanded of the Pope a commission of bishops to try the offending prelates. The Pope did not favour the proposal, regarding himself as the sole judge of bishops, but he was obliged to accept it with unimportant modifications. And the four episcopal charges were placed upon the Roman index, whereupon the bishops of Languedoc presented to the king a complaint of this foreign tribunal which judged episcopal utterances without trial; and the king promised to guard the episcopal rights and Gallican privileges. Thus perplexing was the question of ecclesiastical allegiance.

The Port Royalists were persecuted indeed, but De Sacy was as diligent in his work upon Holy Scripture in the Bastille as in his monastery. Arnauld had completed a translation of the New Testament. Another version, by Amelotte of the Oratory, had already been published in France, and for this reason the necessary authority to print was refused to Arnauld. He had recourse to the Low Countries, and by permission of

the king of Spain and the approbation of the Bishop of Namur, his book was printed at Mons, and spread widely in France, in spite of great opposition on the part of Jesuits and a few bishops. At the same period a Ritual was published by Bishop Pavillon, with the help of Arnauld, which met a warm reception from the French bishops, but disapprobation at Rome, where the Pope issued a brief against it, with a command to bring in and burn all copies; but the brief was not published in France, and was regarded as non-existent. A similar condemnation of the Mons Testament was forwarded by the nuncio to the bishops on his own authority; but the nuncio was obliged to withdraw from his action and ask for a return of all copies of the brief. It remained free, according to the opinion of Bossuet, for all persons to read the Mons version if they would. The opinion of the great bishop was that it was the more elegant translation, but defective in simplicity. But no French version, alas, took hold of the mind of the nation: the French Church, in that sphere of a Church's duty which concerns the making known the Word of God, had no success corresponding to that of her despised English sister. It was reserved for our own days to see a readable French version of the Gospels put forth, with a preface confessing that the book is practically unknown to the French people; but after a brief period of brilliant popularity under the patronage of the body of French bishops and the Pope, it was submissively withdrawn by command of that same foreign Congregation of the Index of which the bishops of France were at this time so justly jealous.

The miserable controversy on doctrine and fact had become wearisome in the extreme when Clement IX., a peaceable and reasonable person, was happily elevated to the Papal throne. Nineteen prelates of France, with the support of twenty more, wrote a letter to implore the Pope to give peace to the Church by forgiving their four brethren. There was in it no withdrawal of the rights of free judgment as to earthly facts.[1] The Bishop of Comminges produced an admirable letter upon the subject, intended to strengthen an alarmed brother prelate. "What S. Paul requires of the faithful," said he, "is to render themselves up as captives to Jesus Christ. What is required by the ultramontanist bishops is to render their souls captive to the word of the Pope. I am persuaded that to say that the Popes, or even the whole Church, have the authority to impose of necessity the yoke of belief, upon their word, as to facts not revealed, and on which no Catholic dare maintain them to be infallible, is to sap the foundations of religion." We are not only not required to yield such a faith, he proceeds, but it is impossible for us to render it. Our understanding is a faculty which acts of necessity, and is not free to reject a truth while it appears a truth. We cannot read these expressions without reflecting on the similarity of the position of those bishops who believed that Jansenius had not written the propositions, and were required to say that he had, and that of the bishops in the present day, who knew as an historical fact that the Popes were not infallible, yet were required to say that they were.

[1] Jervis, Church of France, i. 473.

The attempt which was being made to secure the peace of the Church was kept carefully secret from the Jesuits, and even from the Archbishop of Paris, who would have been sure to tell them. When the negotiations had proceeded so far that success was thought certain, the revelation was made to Archbishop Pérefixe, with the expected effect. The Jesuits were awakened, and made a supreme effort to hinder the peace, but it was happily too late.

The brief of the Pope to the king, which announced this conclusion, declared that the four bishops had signed the formula pure and simple. But they had not been required to do anything which implied the recall of their distinction between law and fact, which they continued to maintain till their deaths. The rest of the Port Royalists, including Arnauld, accepted the terms of pacification, and the nuns of Port Royal were admitted by the archbishop to share the benefit.

The contributions of Port Royal to theology were far from being limited to the controversy with the Jesuits on the principles of morality, but several of them took this form. The *Morale Pratique des Jesuites* by Arnauld was an extensive work, the last volume of which did not issue from the press till after the author's death. He was assisted by friends at Rome in obtaining documents of great importance, and he proved that the Jesuits carried out, in their foreign missions, many of the same practices which made them obnoxious at home. But, besides books of this class, Arnauld and his friends wrote powerfully upon the controversy with the Protestants, the philosophers, and the doubters.

The *Perpetuité de la Foi sur l'Eucharistie* is a repertory of learning, and at least it deprives Calvinism of its claim to represent the Fathers. The learned Renaudot continued the work of Arnauld and Nicole. The latter writer, equally known for his virtues and his genius, excelled his friend Arnauld as a French classic. The learned Tillemont, whom Gibbon depreciates as a useful drudge, deserves better thanks from the searchers of Christian antiquity. De Sacy's labours upon the Bible are out of date, at least for English students, but they were loyal and devoted in their day. There are few departments of theology, or of the subjects which assist it, in which Port Royal did not make its contributions to human thought and progress; so far was it from being a mere school of asceticism, or fanatically devoted to the single subject for which it toiled and suffered so much.

But the Port Royalists did not stand alone in the grand age of Louis XIV., as fertile in sacred learning as it was in literature. This was the age of the Benedictines of S. Maur, and of their immortal labours in patristic literature and in archæology. Mabillon was but the greatest among many great names whose productions are so thorough in their research, and so scientific in their arrangement and argument, that they are authoritative for scholars of all opinions. Another branch of the Reformed Benedictines settled in Lorraine were no unworthy brethren of the French order: to them belong the names of Dom Ceillier, a trustworthy guide to every student of the Fathers and councils, and of Dom Calmet, who continued to be the recognised authority upon

Bible knowledge up to the days of our fathers. The Dominicans could boast of Le Quien and Natalis Alexander; the Oratorians, of Morinus and Thomassinus, and, in a more popular line, of Quesnel, author of the "Moral Reflexions on the New Testament," of which we shall have much to say.

The Jesuits, though their primary object was to acquire knowledge which could be made of immediate use, yet had great scholars in the deeper spheres of theology. Their learned Petavius drew upon himself the reproofs of the Port Royalists, those rigid maintainers of the Catholic tradition, for propounding the first hints of the modern doctrine of Development.

Outside the regular orders Huet, Bishop of Avranches, was as great a scholar in Origen as Jansenius in Augustin; Du Cange produced his Glossary of Middle Latin, a storehouse of mediæval antiquities; Ellies du Pin, of the Faculty, wrote in a far larger spirit than any previous author upon the history and discipline of the Church; and Fleury traversed the whole field of Church history in so fair a temper that his labours made more for peace than for disputation.

Sacred eloquence was a characteristic of this age even better recognised than theological learning. Bourdaloue was the glory of the Jesuit order. He was said to have nothing of the Jesuit but the habit. No share in the party intrigues of his time was ever ascribed to him. Neither do his sermons bear the marks of art so much as of earnest desire to do good. Bossuet was a born orator, and had large effect upon his age; but his methods are far removed from those of our time, and

they astonish more than they affect us. The works of this great man introduce us to every controversy of his time. Against the Ultramontanes, against the Protestants, against the Molinists, against the Quietists, his sword was drawn, and returned not empty. But even in his own day it was the hope of the Protestants that his "Exposition of Catholic Doctrine" might not be approved by the standard of Rome. It was with the greatest care and anxiety that he watched over the production of the Roman edition of the work, and his thanks to all concerned in it, and especially to the Pope of the day, were effusive. The work would have little chance of the approbation of Rome at the present day, and the Gallicanism of the great author might probably be classed, by the school which now predominates in the Roman Catholic Church, as one of those Protestant variations which he criticised with so much effect in his time.

CHAPTER XIX.

REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

Condition of the Church—The Regale—Bossuet—Gallican articles of 1682—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—Persecutions—Revival of the Jansenist controversy—The "Moral Reflexions" of Quesnel—Quietism—Fenelon condemned at Rome—Assembly of 1700.

THE court of Louis XIV. was to the Frenchmen of his time the centre of life and religion. It is hard for us to avoid taking their tone, and forgetting how slight a conception of the work of a Church in the country at large is conveyed to us by our knowledge of the success or failure of palace intrigues; but the glimpses we sometimes gain of the condition of the Church in France are not favourable. Le Camus writes to consult Arnauld whether five years of penitence, after twenty of disorderly living, were enough to justify his acceptance of a bishopric. The good man replies with a strong sympathy for the doubts of his querist; but when he considers the condition of the Church, he cannot exclude from the prelacy any man who is prepared to do his duty in it. "When I regard the pitiable condition to which the Church is reduced, and that it is more true in our times than it was in those of S. Augustine, that one pastor can scarce be found among thousands of mercenaries, who is there who would not fear to take from her one whom Providence appeared to have designated?"

Le Camus accepted the See of Grenoble with the humility and earnestness which Arnauld impressed upon him; and, after a short acquaintance with his diocese, he writes to say that he finds matters far worse than he had been told. Every day more than ten thousand communions, and the same number of confessions, are made in the diocese, and there is not one satisfactory confessor. There is no knowledge of religion: all vices abound: absolute ignorance prevails among seculars and regulars alike. No rule is observed in the ministration of penance. Of such a condition Le Camus found the chief cause in the Jesuits. "I cannot be ignorant," said he, "that the majority of the Jesuits acquit themselves unfaithfully of the ministry of confession, in order to admit to communion every Sunday persons who are in the habit of impurity." De Harlay, Archbishop of Paris, was a man whose impure habits were notorious. The favour of the court was the breath of his life, and it was impossible to have it without the friendship of the Jesuits, to whom belongs the doubtful honour of furnishing confessors to Louis XIV. throughout his years of debauchery, as well as the years of persecution which passed for repentance. De Harlay, with whatever sincerity, held friendly relations with Arnauld during his early episcopate, and received from him confidential letters which described the infractions of the peace on the part of the Jesuits. It was easy, however, to see that they must succeed, having to do with a king who wanted easy absolutions; and De Harlay soon ceased from his professions of friendship for Port Royal, the rather because Arnauld

expressed himself with great freedom upon the prelate's life in a letter which was intercepted and submitted to the subject of its criticism. But Port Royal had powerful friends in Clement X. and Innocent XI., and in Cardinal Cibo, the minister of the latter Pope; yet in the hope of preventing trouble to his friends, Arnauld determined to retire from France.[1] He took refuge in the Austrian Netherlands, and France had the disgrace of banishing from her borders a theologian of saintly character, admired by all Europe, to live in poverty in a foreign land, while rich benefices were lavished upon men who had neither learning nor labours to recommend them.

Arnauld increased the anger which Louis already felt against him for abandoning the kingdom, by declaring against the sovereign, in a quarrel which caused a breach between the kingdom and the Papacy, and was full of important consequence. We have often noticed the claim of the French crown which bears the name of the Regale.[2] It gave the king, in certain dioceses and offices, the right to enjoy the revenues during a vacancy, and to appoint to any preferments in the gift of the said offices, provided that cure of souls was not attached to them. But among the bishoprics and abbeys which were exempt from the regale were those of Languedoc.

The French monarchs had always displayed an encroaching spirit in this matter, and Louis XIV. conceived no less a project than that of extending the regale over all the kingdom, as if it had been an in-

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 21. [2] Ibid. ii. 23.

herent right of the crown. Most of the bishops submitted with patience, but the bishops of Aleth and Pamiers stood firm side by side against the exaggeration of royal rights, as they had against that of Papal. The Jesuits were on the side of the king, and against the Pope; the fortunes of the order, which were dearer to them than either, were at stake. They did not, indeed, accept the Erastian theory of the parliamentary Gallicans. But the orthodoxy of the king and the benefits which he conferred upon the Church by persecuting the Protestants, enabled good Catholics to recognise rights in him which would have been flat sacrilege in ordinary monarchs. The Bishop of Aleth, one of the best prelates in France, died while his appeal to Rome against the assertion of the regale was pending.[1] He left his companion in patience, the Bishop of Pamiers, to bear the brunt of the battle, and this aged prelate was deprived of his temporalities, and died in the midst of the contest.

The Pope interfered with energy in defence of the rights of the Church, and Louis heard from him some truths to which he was little accustomed. His Jesuit confessor, Père de la Chaise, and Archbishop De Harlay recognised their own portraits in the Pope's description of the royal advisers, as people of low and interested views, who only thought of maintaining their own power under pretence of enlarging the king's, and feigning to be devoted to his greatness, were the enemies of his true glory. It was under these circumstances that the assembly of the clergy

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 27.

came together in 1681. The Abbé Desmarets, agent of the clergy, complained that the Pope had not recognised as he ought all that the king did for the Catholic religion, in seeking by all means to destroy heresies and propagate the true faith. "An almost infinite number of Protestant temples overthrown, and services of the so-called Reformed religion forbidden, and of heretics converted," together with other services of a less questionable nature, were so many public testimonies of his piety, for which the Church could not sufficiently mark its gratitude. The Archbishop of Reims presented the report of a committee in still more servile terms of eulogy. "The king himself," said he, "sets himself to ruin heresy in his dominions with such success that it is possible to believe without flattery, that if God preserves for us this great prince as long as all good men should desire, he will succeed in smothering this monster in his kingdom."

This was the judgment of a Christian assembly upon such acts and such a ruler. The speaker proceeded to remind the Pontiff that the condition of Europe was such that it was only from the king of France that the aids which he required for his excellent projects for the Church could be hoped. We sympathise with the speaker in his opposition to ultramontanism, desiring only that it had been untainted with servility to a tyrant, and that it had been grounded on a recognition of the rights of conscience.

Bossuet was raised to the Bishopric of Meaux in 1681, and received the delicate and difficult commission of preaching the opening sermon at the assembly of

clergy in the following year. He took infinite pains to state the authority of the Pope and the Gallican liberties with equal emphasis. He was aware that the tender ears of the Romans must be respected, and yet it was impossible for him wholly to omit, in preaching to a French assembly, either the independence of princes in temporal affairs, or the direct dependence of episcopal authority on the Lord Himself, or the authority of councils.

Bossuet was of opinion that the question of the regale could be determined by mutual concessions. The king surrendered some advantages, but the clergy, upon their part, consented to the extension of the regale into all the Church, even those sees which had been formerly exempt from it. And Bossuet held the impression that consent to such a settlement could be obtained from the Pope; but he was mistaken. The Pope conceived himself to be contending for the time-honoured liberties of the Church, and he did not understand the claim of an assembly, the constitution of which had never been fully recognised at Rome, to make a present to the king of advantages in property and power at the Church's expense.

Arnauld had gained, by his exile, at least the power to speak plainly, and he ranged himself upon the side of the Pope, in the dispute concerning the regale, just as the Abbé of S. Cyran had espoused the Papal opinion upon the marriage of Gaston of Orleans. But while yet the conclusion of this particular question was undecided, the assembly of clergy had passed the four famous articles of 1682, the watchword of the Gallican

liberties. This important formula laid down the following principles:—I. There was no infallible guidance promised to the Bishop of Rome as regards temporal affairs,[1] and kings and sovereigns are not subject to any ecclesiastical power by the order of God in things temporal. II. The decrees of the Council of Constance are still in force. III. The use of the apostolic power must be regulated by the canons. IV. Although the Pope has the chief part in determining questions of faith, and his decrees concern all the churches, and each church in particular, yet his judgment is not irreformable unless the consent of the Church intervenes.[2]

This summary of Gallicanism seems to have been drawn up by Bossuet at the suggestion of Colbert, to whom the first idea belonged, and who performed the task of bringing over the king to the idea of reviving the theory of Gallican independence, which had slumbered so long. Bossuet would not have desired the assertion of his principles by an Act of the assembly had not the king wished for it; but in fact the statement was not new. It was founded upon six articles already adopted by the Faculty of Theology in 1663, at a time when, under the patronage of Marie de Medicis and Mazarin, ultramontanism had spread in the country.

The Four Articles were published in an edict by the king, and registered by the Parliament; but, in the eyes of Ultramontanes, a stigma attaches to its

[1] For Bossuet's opinion upon Papal infallibility in spiritual affairs see the *Defensio Cleri Gallic: Œuvres, ed Bar le Duc*, vii. 562.

[2] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 49-55.

origin; the assembly of the clergy of France had, rather for convenience than through any ecclesiastical delegation, gradually acquired the habit of treating doctrine. However, it must be noted that the articles do not profess to establish or define a doctrine, but merely to declare what the immemorial doctrine of the Church of France had been, and there can be no doubt that their testimony upon this point is true. It was received by the whole kingdom without doubt or hesitation, and the Jesuits distinguished themselves by their zeal in its propagation, which was the more remarkable because they were already in trouble with the Pope about the circulation of his brief upon the regale. His Holiness despatched it through the general to the provincials of the Jesuits in France, but these officials evaded the difficulty of choosing whether to displease the Pope or the king, by having themselves cited to appear before Parliament to render account of the communication of their general. A strict injunction was given to the society to publish no decrees of Rome save under letters-patent from the king. It is difficult to see how the Fathers reconciled their obedience to the Parliament rather than the Pope with their fourth vow. But they did.

The Sorbonne displayed some jealousy of the intrusion of the assembly of clergy into the functions of a theological faculty, but of the doctrine of the Four Articles it made no doubt, and defined its position in the dispute by censuring the proposition that the Pope is the supreme judge of controversies of faith. This tenet was rejected as depriving the bishops of the

title to be judges of faith, which belongs to them by divine law.

These many strokes inflicted upon ultramontanism in France excited high disapproval at Rome, of which Bossuet was informed by his correspondents. The Bishop of Meaux expresses, in his reply, sentiments and arguments which might well have been used at the Vatican Council. "Does Bellarmine," he asks, "rule alone at Rome, and does he constitute in his single person the whole Catholic tradition? What shall we answer the heretics when they remind us of the decrees of Constance, repeated at Bâle with the express approval of Eugenius IV.? If Eugenius IV. did right in authentically approving those decrees, how can they be assailed? And if he did wrong, where, we shall be asked, was his pretended infallibility? I cannot imagine that a Pope so zealous for the conversion of heretics and the reunion of schismatics, will place an eternal obstacle to it by a decision such as that with which he menaces us." Arnauld, from his exile, judged like Bossuet of the situation, and he nobly published his judgment at the risk of losing the favour of the Pope, as he had lost that of the king. The condemnation of the Four Articles at Rome would, he thought, hinder the conversion of heretics. If the articles were condemned as errors approaching to heresy, Catholics would be mocked at when they assured the Protestants that they were not obliged to believe the Pope infallible, nor ascribe to him the power to depose kings. In the progress of time the latter claim has become obsolete, through sheer irrelevancy to the processes by which

kings are created or deposed; but this very disappearance of the Pope out of temporal politics has accompanied the establishment, as a dogma, of that personal infallibility which Bossuet and Arnauld assured their disciples that they need not believe. The Pope, however, dared not publish the censure of the four articles which had been prepared, but he showed his displeasure by refusing bulls to all clerks nominated to bishoprics by the king, if they had taken part in the assembly of 1682.

We see how full were the minds of Bossuet and Arnauld of the effects which the Papal declarations might possess upon their controversy with Protestants, but measures were in contemplation, the gigantic wickedness of which was destined to remove the controversy with Rome out of the range of reasoning altogether. Citizens of a nation under the rule of force cannot hope that laws in their favour will be observed if they have not the power to assert themselves; thus it was useless for the nobles of France to plead their prescriptive rights, or even the laws of property, when the Revolution was upon them. But the national peace, which was sealed by the Edict of Nantes, had the nature of a fundamental historical compact, in addition to the natural rights of conscience and the Christian sanctions which it could plead. We may therefore well say that no excess of the Revolution was a clearer breach of right and justice than the revocation of this edict presented; but this was the measure which King Louis XIV., in the pride of his pomp and vanity, and in compensation to Christianity for his sinful lusts, designed

to take. It was the same attempt which our James II. essayed. In the one case the king was lost and the nation preserved; in the other the king remained, and the nation was fatally hurt. Louis had the encouragement of his spiritual advisers at Rome and in France. Bossuet may have disapproved the frightful cruelties of the dragonnades,[1] but he approved the revocation of the edict. The assembly of the clergy in 1685 found the king's intention expressed in so many preliminary acts of persecution[2] that only the shadow of the edict remained. They offered the assistance required of them in the form of twenty-nine articles for the forcible suppression of Protestant rights, and for the encouragement and reward of changes of belief.[3] The edict was revoked, and the cruelties which followed proved

[1] For a brief statement of the horrors perpetrated on the French Protestants see Taine, *Ancien Régime*, pp. 80, 81; Martin, xv. 230. The Penal Laws in Ireland were bad enough, but the very term implies that Romanism had leave to exist under penalties. Protestantism in France had no such permission.

[2] I have before me a little book, published (without place) in 1673, and entitled, *De Tribus in Gallia Religionibus*. It comes from a Protestant source, but the first piece of four which it contains is a letter from a Jesuit to the Protestant minister, Bochart, subtly and forcibly arguing that the French Protestants, who in 1630 admitted some Lutherans to communion in spite of their belief in Consubstantiation, have no reason to separate from the Church of their country on account of Transubstantiation. The second piece is an able reply from Bochart, in which the other causes for separation are duly named, and upon the question of the Blessed Sacrament itself it is argued that a doctrine which acknowledges the reality of the substance of the elements is far less likely to lead to idolatry than one in which nothing real is supposed to be present except the Body and Blood. The third is a most affecting and convincing picture of the miseries and tyrannies to which the Protestants were subjected before the revocation of the edict. See also Martin, *Hist. de France*, xiv. 37 *et seq.*

[3] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 65.

that Protestants were to have no rights as citizens, or even the peace extended to foreigners. A large number of them quitted the country, to prove in foreign lands that those whom their own countrymen cast forth as enemies of religion were examples of industry and piety.

Among the crowd of edicts which followed up the great stroke, one may remark especially that which deprived Protestant parents of their children during the years of education, and that which condemned to the galleys any converts to Catholicism who should refuse the sacraments when supposed to be dying, and should afterwards recover. The care of seeing that the new converts went to Mass was committed to the officers of the troops quartered in Languedoc; to such ministers did the Catholic king apply the Apostolic words, "They watch for your souls as they that must give account." The penalty of remissness in religious duties was a double or a triple number of dragoons, directed by Louis to live very licentiously,[1] and quartered on the guilty householder. Certain remembrances of Scotch and Irish history oblige us to include our own progenitors in the condemnation which we extend to such proceedings; but in no case was persecution resorted to with so little excuse from political dangers, nor pursued to such lengths, nor with such universal approval from the national representatives of religion.[2]

[1] The king himself perhaps did not know of this direction, though issued in his name. Martin, *Hist. de France*, xiv. 49.

[2] Cardinal Bausset, in his *Histoire de Bossuet*, liv. xi. 17, attributes the persecutions to Louis and his lay advisers, especially Louvois; at the same time excusing them by the general feeling of the time, and the approval which their measures secured. The clergy, and in par-

Arnauld himself did not protest; but though this good man never reached the theory of toleration, which our own Jeremy Taylor had propounded nearly half a century before, yet he was pleased that there was no rejoicing in Rome at the revocation of the edict, and

ticular Bossuet, he regards as obliged to do what they could under the difficulty of finding tens of thousands of forced converts thrown on their hands in a state canonically unfit to be admitted to the sacraments. It is not true that the question was so clear at the time, and, in any case, the clergy went far beyond a passive submission to the measure. M. Martin even supposes it likely, though Bausset denies, that Bossuet was one of the two unknown theologians who advised the revocation. But he approved it in the most emphatic terms. "You have confirmed the faith," he cried; "you have exterminated the heretics. It is the worthy work—the distinctive impress of your reign. By your means heresy exists no more. God alone could have effected this miracle."—"Funeral Sermon on Chancellor le Tellier," quoted by Martin, *Hist. de France*, xiv. 55.

M. de Souligné, grandson of Duplessis Mornay, published in London, 1698, a little book on the "Political Mischiefs of Popery," dedicated to the English House of Commons. His account of the scandals and infamies of religion in France are of the violent Protestant type, and such as one might expect from a man who had been exiled from his country. It is better, upon that point, to confine ourselves to the testimony of members of the Church itself; but it is curious to find him stating that, ever since the king ascended the throne, "the honester sort of Papists in that kingdom have entertained hopes that this great and glorious prince would deliver it from the Pope's disgraceful yoke by creating a Patriarch" (p. 117). It is the impression of this writer that all the parliaments and persons of learning would turn Protestant but for fear of the king. But he is a better prophet when he says that the present miserable condition of the kingdom requires the abolition of the Papacy, "to the end that the king may appropriate to himself all or the greater part of the riches of the Church which belongs to nobody, and whereof he might dispose for the safety of the State without any injustice, by which means he would be enabled to pay his debts to every one, and to prevent a civil war, which seems to threaten France unavoidably if there came a king of less authority than Louis the XIV., by reason of the desperate condition to which people of all ranks are upon the brink of being reduced." The confiscation of the Church arrived a century after, but the civil war was not prevented.

at a later period he confessed that Catholics themselves might be divided on the means used in France for the conversion of heretics.[1]

The renewal of the Jansenist controversy had been long desired by the Jesuits, but the immediate occasion was the publication of an "Exposition of the Faith of the Roman Church upon Grace and Predestination."[2] The author, who died seventeen years before the publication, was De Barcos, nephew and successor of the Abbé of S. Cyran. It was composed for the saintly Bishop of Aleth, and had been used in manuscript in that diocese from its first composition. De Noailles, successor to De Harlay in the See of Paris, and a far better man, was forced by the fear of displeasing the king, with whom he was a favourite, to publish a "Pastoral Instruction" in opposition to this book. But the condemnation was accompanied by an exposition, drawn up by Bossuet, of the Augustinian doctrine of grace. This treatise offended the Jesuits far more than the condemnation of Jansenism pleased them. At the same time De Noailles instituted a strict review of the "Moral Reflexions" of Quesnel, with a view to publish it for the use of the diocese. Bossuet again placed his authority at the service of his friend. He carefully examined the "Reflexions" and found them orthodox. Nevertheless, the "Reflexions," through fear of offence to the king, were not officially published in the diocese of Paris, but the archbishop sanctioned them in various orders.

[1] Mr. Jervis truly remarks that the low notion of the meaning of belief implied in the idea that it could be secured by constraint, had its part in promoting infidelity. Church of France, ii. 69.

[2] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 17.

In these labours for his diocese the archbishop was assailed by an anonymous libel entitled *Problème Ecclésiastique*, which attempted to establish a contrast between his professed anti-Jansenist sentiments and the "Reflexions," to which he thus gave his approval. The author of this libel was never discovered, but it was attributed to the Jesuits, and formed the prelude to more determined assaults at a later period. The pamphlet was condemned by the Parliament to be burned.[1]

Bossuet took a part in another discussion of the time, which set him in opposition to his friend Fenelon. In the controversy about Quietism, the authority of Pope and king together came into action, with all the intrigues and influences by which they were equally surrounded, and the affair seems to us to have been so ill managed, that it had better if it had not been managed at all. Quietism was a reaction against external and formal religion; it was wanted in its day, although, like all reactions, it exaggerated. The French prophetess of Quietism was Madame Guyon, of whom and of her system Fenelon became a devoted adherent. A circle was formed, such as has so often gathered; such as Cowper's, such as Coleridge's. But they were dangerous times for religious peculiarities, and Madame Guyon was shut up. Severity was not exercised while her doctrine was being examined, and Bossuet, De Noailles, and another divine undertook the task. They held their conferences at Issy, in the diocese of Paris, and De Harlay, who was then archbishop, jealous

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 93.

of his episcopal rights, anticipated their report by issuing a mandate against the movement in question. However, so little desire was there to deal harshly, that Fenelon, who never disguised his adherence to Madame Guyon, was at this time nominated to the See of Cambray. He was invited to join the conference at Issy, and a series of thirty-five articles was drawn up upon mystical theology and religion. They led to a temporary reconciliation. But articles have never had much effect in questions of the inner life, and Bossuet thought it useful to guide the prevalent fashion in devotion by an "Instruction on the States of Prayer." Fenelon saw it in manuscript but declined to give his approval, and by extraordinary diligence, both in composition and printing, he anticipated the appearance of Bossuet's treatise by his own "Explanations of the Maxims of the Saints upon the Interior Life." [1]

Fenelon's work, however, produced no effect upon the courtly public, ready as they were to admire him; and finding himself without supporters in France, he determined to carry the question to Rome. He was sure to meet a favourable reception there, because the Popes, as we know, were very desirous of pronouncing judgments at first hand. He also succeeded in engaging the interest at Rome of the Cardinal of Bouillon, a somewhat ridiculous personage of high birth, who was despatched just at the time as French ambassador. Fenelon also depended on the aid of the Jesuits whose ultramontane doctrine he followed. But the Jesuits

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 129.

were in a strait; they desired to serve him but not to lose their credit at court. Their preachers, with an unanimity which indicated orders received, denounced Quietism. There was nothing, however, in that, which should prevent their superiors from favouring Fenelon at Rome. While the rival treatises were under examination there, the controversy did not slumber in France. Pastorals, pamphlets, and books flew from side to side. Though a primary reference to Rome was not after Bossuet's principles, yet he took care that nothing should be left unsaid there which could assist his cause.

The examiners held sixty-four sittings, and found themselves equally divided. The Pope was left without advice, and Fenelon would probably have escaped at least without condemnation if the king had not made his desire known. The method in which the will of the court was expressed was as objectionable as could be imagined. It consisted in dismissing, from their employments and from the court, the friends and connections of the archbishop, however innocent of offence they might be; an indirect and unjust form of language, but it secured the desired end. The condemnation issued from Rome, and the submission which it received from Fenelon is counted an example of Christian virtue. But even if obedience to external command in matters of the soul were so great a virtue, we should still be left to ask whether any possible interest or advantage could have counselled Fenelon to do otherwise? If it was submission to the Pope, it was also submission to the king, by whose influence the judgment was

extracted. His friends had good hope that the exemplary perfection of his obedience would have procured him a cardinal's hat. But the methods which had ensured the condemnation claimed so little reverence at the time, that Saint Simon mentions a nobleman who was converted from a belief in the personal infallibility of the Pope by the history of the condemnation, which he knew to be an affair of cabal in France and of politics in Rome, and might very well be retracted if times should change.

Whether Bossuet was to blame for the vehemence which he threw into the controversy, is a matter which must be left to the students of his life. The question was doubtless of great importance, but the decision probably tended, like those against the Jansenists, to expel the supernatural element from religion, and reduce it to a form. The action of the Papacy, independent of any judgment of the French bishops, certainly inflicted a severe blow on Gallican principles.

The last efforts of Bossuet's laborious life were devoted to a noble object; that of securing a condemnation by the assembled clergy of the immoral principles of the casuistry of the day. The leading doctrines of the system were Probability and Attrition. The doctrine of Probability left a man but few sins wherewith to reproach himself, since all acts could be wiped out of the category which one grave doctor could be found to excuse. And for those which remained, forgiveness might be obtained without any agonies of remorse. The sorrow of the world need no longer work death; accompanied by confession, it might be the way to life.

Bossuet was a staunch Augustinian, and, along with false casuistry, he desired to condemn the semi-Pelagian system of grace with which it was so closely associated. A flagrant instance of similar teaching in the missionary world claimed his attention. The Jesuits were accused of having made concessions in the permission of idolatry, to swell the number of their converts in China. Bossuet was associated with the Archbishops of Paris and Reims, and having the support of Madame de Maintenon, they secured the consent of the king on condition that the authors condemned should not be named. And to deprive opponents of the opportunity of starting a false issue, Jansenism was included among the errors to be visited. The Assembly of 1700 witnessed this wonderful scene of purgation. The project of censure included one hundred and sixty propositions, of which five were Jansenist, five Molinist, and one hundred and fifty were casuistical. Bossuet was the life of the Assembly, and worked indefatigably in preparing his arguments. The old man resumed his youthful habit of rising in the night to work.

One hundred and twenty-nine propositions were returned by the committee to the Assembly as worthy of censure. The bishops who sat upon the committee with Bossuet would willingly have omitted the Jansenist propositions, as referring to extinct errors and quite unnecessary. Some of the Molinist statements were also omitted. Bossuet sacrificed two, but adhered to the rest. The casuistical propositions were the true subject of censure, and they remained almost in

their entirety. The doctrine of Probabilism furnished Bossuet's power of invective with a worthy subject. And on September 4 the whole scheme of censure was adopted and signed by the Assembly. The bishop had gained a great victory over falsehood, and had carried into the deliberations of the clergy the very same subjects upon which Pascal had asked the opinion of the world at large.[1]

The Chinese ceremonies were omitted from the censures of the Assembly for fear of offence to Rome, which was busy upon the subject, although with a lengthiness of procedure even beyond its wont. But it was thought fit that some censure on the subject should be uttered by a French Assembly, and a condemnation of the Jesuit opinions upon the Chinese rites was passed by the Faculty of Theology. A defence of the censure was composed by Ellies du Pin, at the desire of Bossuet and Le Tellier. So terminated this quarrel upon French ground. The same discussion in the mission-field itself led to grievous acts of violence, which it is not our business to relate.

[1] *Histoire de Bossuet*, by Cardinal Bausset, liv. xi. 3 *et seq.* *Œuvres de Bossuet*, Bar le Duc, 1862, vol. i. p. 299.

CHAPTER XX.

THE BULL UNIGENITUS.

The Case of Conscience—The bull *Vineam Domini*—Destruction of Port Royal—Assault on the "Moral Reflexions"—Royal order—The bull *Unigenitus* imposed on the Church of France—Death of Louis XIV.—Character of the Ultramontane Cardinals—The twelve articles of Cardinal de Noailles—His death—Persecution of Bishop Soanen.

THE truce of Clement IX. in the great campaign of Law and Fact had in it the seeds of a revival of war. For the four prelates had been admitted to peace upon terms which enabled them to maintain their conviction that the Church, though infallible in doctrine, is fallible in fact. While the Pope, in order to save the credit of his predecessor, affected to consider that they assented *ex animo* to the historical ruling that the propositions were not only false, but were in Jansenius. It was one of the many cases in which the existence of an irreformable authority, instead of ending doubt, makes additional confusion.

A confessor proposed to the Faculty of Theology of Paris the far-famed[1] Case of Conscience, which ran thus: A penitent rejected the doctrine of the Five Propositions, but was able to render an obedience only of silence and respect to the Papal judgment that they

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 169.

were in Jansenius; and he held that this was all that the Holy See required according to the mind of the briefs of Innocent XII. From whichever side this move may have come, we may call it a perverse scrupulosity that urged this penitent to bring before his confessor at all a state of mind which his conscience did not feel to be sinful, and pronounce the confessor a busybody who could not deal with such a matter according to the man's state of mind, and give him absolution if he honestly thought as he said. The authority of the Church as to facts is no unimportant matter; but it is very difficult to say either what it is or how it is exercised; and the case in question was a poor one in which to try the principle. A hundred real sins might escape notice while the sinner and his guide were abroad upon such vague rambles. However, the question was asked, and forty doctors of the Faculty, after serious deliberation, made reply that the opinions of the penitent were neither new, singular, nor condemned by the Church, and that the confessor had no right to insist on a retractation. For the Jesuits, on their own principles, this should have sufficed; for if it be lawful to follow a probable opinion, and an opinion be probable if supported by one grave doctor, forty should be abundant, more especially as their own illustrious Petavius and Sirmond were of the same opinion; but the opportunity of raising a cry that Jansenism was reviving could not be neglected, and they were specially urgent with the bishops, whose censures passed in A.D. 1700 were concerned. For Bossuet demanded more than respectful silence for the

Church's assertion of dogmatic facts. The respectful silence must carry with it an internal assent, though not the divine faith which belongs to revealed facts.

The position is difficult to understand. We might indeed secure this state of mind in matters of which we have insufficient knowledge, or in which we are no judges; but respectful silence, with an internal assent to the duty of keeping silence, seems to be the utmost to which we could go in the case of a fact within our competence to judge, and on which we have a belief different from that of the authority. Bossuet thought that to sign the formulary of Alexander VII., having within our mind the distinction of law and fact, was a formal falsehood; Arnauld, stern moralist as he was, believed that he had a right to sign it in a sense allowed by Clement IX., whose authority was equal to that of the Pope who issued it, more especially when it was believed that the issue of the formulary was due to Jesuit intrigue. Bossuet accordingly blamed the forty doctors, but said that the affair belonged to Cardinal de Noailles, as having taken place in his diocese. There was reason to think that De Noailles approved the judgment of the forty. But the king was a hater of Jansenism, and was led to believe that it was reviving, and he, as well as Madame de Maintenon, were against the Case of Conscience. The archbishop could not imperil his credit with the court, and finally issued a condemnation of the Case of Conscience, which was also censured by the Pope.

The larger part of the forty submitted, but some sturdy scholars held out, among them the learned Du

Pin, who was committed to prison, and the privilege of printing his works withdrawn. Fenelon went all the way with the Jesuits. Bossuet laboured with some success to find a way of reconciliation. Not a few features of this strange controversy are reproduced in our contests on the facts of Old Testament history, and the authority of the Church in regard to them; but when we read the story of the French disputes, we are by no means tempted, in the interests of peace, to wish that the Pope had the same power to interfere among us as he had among them.

In the midst of the discussion, and while preparing a work upon the belief due to the Church upon dogmatic facts, Bossuet felt the approach of death: it was attended by the agonies of the stone. But he was able to turn his mind both from pain and from argument to face the change with dignity and faith. The stage remained for inferior men. Fenelon was no guide of thought upon questions so difficult as that which was in agitation, and one of the best treatises upon it was a letter from the aged bishop of S. Pons, who, after forty years' silence on the forbidden question of Jansenism, uplifted his voice against Fenelon's denunciations of what he was pleased to call the absurd and contradictory opinions of those who could not join him in an effacement of reason which went beyond Baronius or Bellarmine.[1]

The bull *Vineam Domini* was the outcome of the discussion. It pronounced interior submission to the Church's decision on dogmatic facts to be requisite; to

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 174.

sign the formula without it was to fail in the duty of obedience.

The bull was sent by the king to the Assembly of the Clergy, then in session. The committee upon it reported, through its chairman, the Archbishop of Rouen, in favour of receiving the bull, with the statement that the bishops have by right divine the judgment of doctrine along with the Pope, and that Papal bulls are not of obligation till the episcopate has judicially received them.[1] But such an acceptance was, in the eyes of Rome, an act of disobedience. It was found insulting by Cardinal Fabroni, who was extremely powerful at Rome, and the sign of this resentment was a determination to wage war on the "Moral Reflexions" of Quesnel, which De Noailles had recommended to his diocese. The venerable author of the book had followed Arnauld to the Low Countries, and devoted himself to the defence of his friend; but, now that Spain was ruled by a Bourbon, the Low Countries were no longer a safe retreat, and Quesnel was committed to the prison of the Archbishop of Malines, and treated with great severity. Peaceful students, and even booksellers, found themselves exiled or imprisoned.

But it was Port Royal des Champs which suffered the effects of Jesuit hatred to the full. Who has not read the sad story of the armed invasion of the retreat which twenty holy women sanctified by their prayers?[2] Most of them were old, and separa-

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 179.

[2] Gregoire, the constitutional bishop, of whom we shall have much to say hereafter, published an account of a visit in 1809 to the ruins of Port Royal. The sad story of the monastery, its work, and its fate is

tion was worse than death, yet none flinched. The bull for the oppression of Port Royal, and the king's concurrence to execute the order, brings forcibly to our minds the conspiracy of a former Pope and king for the destruction of the Templars. That the Jesuits should take delight in crushing a few pious women who resisted them does not surprise us. The gloomy Tellier was now confessor to the king, and the success of the society seemed in him to have taken the place of every affection and of every pleasure. We understand well how such representatives of Christianity should have brought expulsion on themselves, and roused in France not merely indifference, but hatred to religion, as if it were an enemy of good.

De Noailles lent himself to the persecution,[1] but was soon to experience in his own person the enmity of the insolent and aggressive faction. The campaign against the "Moral Reflexions" opened by a censure from the Bishop of Apt, a poor instrument of the Jesuits, who had not even read the book which he condemned. Other episcopal mandates followed in the same direction, but Fabroni, and even Clement XI., were hostile to De Noailles, and eager to act. This explained the haste, so different from the usual lingering pace of

told in this book with all the power and all the hatred of ultramontanism which might be expected from the author. See the account of another visit, five years later, in Mrs. Schimmelpenninck's "Memoirs of Port Royal," vol. iii., London, 1868. Readers who feel that the history we have laid before them omits of necessity the spiritual aspects and lessons which the saintly inhabitants of Port Royal bequeathed, may be referred to this beautiful and spiritual book.

[1] And suffered intense remorse for it afterwards. Jervis, Church of France, ii. 187–193.

Rome, with which a brief against the book of Quesnel appeared. The animus of this document is revealed by its sarcastic repetition of various phrases from the letter in which five French bishops had condemned certain semi-Pelagian treatises favoured at Rome; but this brief contained expressions injurious to Gallican rights, and was received neither by the episcopate nor the Parliament, and circulated only in a clandestine manner. The failure of smaller measures prepared the way, as before, for a formal bull; but De Noailles, though he no longer had the living hand of Bossuet to strengthen him, produced a great reaction in favour of the Reflexions by publishing the work in which the great bishop had expressed his approval of the work.

There were at the time two bishops, of little personal importance, who ruled the dioceses of Lucon and La Rochelle. These prelates issued in 1710 a pastoral instruction, believed to have been composed for them, in which the Reflexions were condemned with all the terrors of ecclesiastical objurgation. Each of them had a nephew studying at S. Sulpice, and these champions undertook the work of posting the production of their relatives in the diocese of Paris.[1] More than twenty copies were affixed to the gates of the archbishop's palace. The nephews were expelled from S. Sulpice at the direction of the archbishop, and complained of him at the courts of Rome and France with an absurd violence which disgusted both authorities. But when the archbishop at the solicitation of his

[1] Doubt has been thrown upon the guilt of these students, but see Jervis, Church of France, ii. 291 *n*.

clergy published a censure of the pastoral, he was sharply reproved by the court. He replied with dignity that if the king would reflect on the case he would see the injustice of allowing two bishops, the lowest of all in every point of view, to publish their pastoral, right or wrong, and to deny the same power to an archbishop of Paris.

Tellier received a severe fright, and apprehended for some days an expulsion from the court in consequence of the discovery that he was manufacturing letters for the signature of country bishops, requesting action against the Reflexions. The agent in the transaction sacrificed himself, of course, and Tellier denied all knowledge of the matter; but no one believed him. He had a friend at court in Bissy, successor to Bossuet at Meaux, who was as powerful with Madame de Maintenon as she with the king; and Louis himself was very willing to retain a confessor whose principle was that the goods of the subject belonged to the king; a welcome doctrine to the ruined monarch in the last gloomy years of his reign. De Noailles was frank with his sovereign in expressing his sense of the unworthy hands into which he was committing his soul;[1] but without effect. However, encouraged by universal sympathy in his diocese, he abridged the powers entrusted to Jesuit confessors, and boldly threw upon the king himself the responsibility of leaving Tellier in his place.

These restraints incensed Tellier and his associates so extremely, that a "dark intrigue" was formed to

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 205.

elicit from the Pope a formal condemnation of a number of propositions from the Reflexions, without regard to the right of primary judgment which belonged to the bishops of France, or to the amount of theological authority, present and past, both in France and every other part of Christendom, which was committed to the views of the book.

The inducement to this daring stretch of Papal authority was the claim of infallibility which it involved, and to which the episcopate of France, debased by so many Jesuit nominees, might be expected to submit. It is sad that Fenelon should be of the number, but the censure of a book to which his opponents Bossuet and De Noailles stood committed, was too pleasant a counterpoise to the censure of his own.

To convince the Pope that such a constitution would be well received by the king, Tellier obtained a royal order to suppress Quesnel's work, and withdrew the privilege of printing. Thus pretended friends of ecclesiastical authority encouraged the secular power to condemn by its own mere motion, and out of the plenitude of its ignorance, a book recommended by habitual use during a quarter of a century in the French Church, and by the approval of its greatest doctor. But the means of judgment which Rome could command in the case of a French book was immeasurably inferior to that which existed in France. The knowledge of the French tongue which the Congregation possessed was most limited, and the only French scholar among the consulters was sent out of the way

lest his Augustinian proclivities should render his explanations of the "Reflexions" too favourable. Under such conditions the bull *Unigenitus* was produced. If we may believe Saint Simon, the Pope himself, on whose authority the bull depended, was, like many another autocrat, the slave of his own instruments, and would willingly have had more time for consideration before condemning saints and apostles. But it was refused him, and the bull issued September 8, 1713.[1]

The bull *Unigenitus* is instructive reading. It is possible that the one hundred and one propositions which it condemns may appear, when extracted from their contexts and massed together, to represent a too exclusive evangelicalism. Even so, they may serve to show how the tendency to which we apply that term found room even in the Church of Rome, and how large was the acceptance which it met there. To condemn it was to attempt the expulsion from Christianity of its spiritual element, and to leave little more than an earthly system called by divine names. What are we to think of the spiritual authority which qualifies as "ill-sounding and savouring of heresy" the statement that "there is a difference between the grace of Adam in the state of ignorance and Christian grace; that each one would have received the former in his proper person, while no one receives the latter save in the person of the risen Saviour, to whom we are united;" which regards as "injurious to the Church, rash, scandalous, seditious, and favourable to heretics

[1] See the account of the Pope's remorse witnessed by Amelot. Jervis, Church of France, ii. 2 6.

and heresies," the comment upon Acts viii. 28, that "the reading of Holy Scripture, even in the hands of a man of affairs and business, shows that it is intended for every one;" which applies the terms "scandalous, erroneous, favourable to schism, and savouring of heresy" to the assertion that "it is the Church which has the authority of excommunication to exercise by means of its chief pastors, with the consent, at least presumed, of the whole body."[1] If ever a sentence by any tribunal, secular or religious, bore the stamp of purely human origin in its antecedents, its circumstances, its contents, and its results, it was this bull.

The Jesuits exulted, and, with the royal authority at their disposal, they prepared to force the constitution upon France as the abundant sanction of their semi-Pelagian doctrine. The Church was to be compelled by the secular power to accept a novel doctrine of grace, but the question was by what process the new revelation was to be substituted for the old.[2] The accredited processes were too slow, and afforded the prospect of controversies; the king was old, and the opportunity must vanish with his death. Tellier preferred the uncanonical, though not unexampled plan of gathering the bishops who happened to be in Paris, including bishops *in partibus*, and elects not yet in possession of their sees, and thus to frame a body which should be taken to represent the Church of France. Forty-nine bishops formed this scratch assembly, which was called by the king, and regarded itself as an instrument of

[1] See some other extracts in Jervis, Church of France, ii. 213.
[2] Ibid., ii. 216.

the royal pleasure. Forty accepted the constitution pure and simple. Nine, with De Noailles and the Archbishop of Tours at their head, withdrew from the business, and declared themselves unable to accept the bull without explanations.

The Parliament, under sheer force, was compelled to recognise this unconstitutional reception as the act of the clergy of France, and to register the bull. Through similar violence it was accepted by the Faculty of Theology against solemn protest, and the acceptance was recalled in the next reign as done under compulsion. Wrath was hot against De Noailles. The Pope blamed those bishops who had not rendered him the "obedience which was due to him." He demanded of the king the exile of the cardinal, who presumed to raise questions, or that the Diocese of Paris should be committed to a suffragan, while De Noailles should be summoned to answer for himself at Rome. Amidst the tumult Quesnel, now eighty years old, whose book was the subject of the battle, defended it without any failure of intellect or spirit, and called God to witness that none of the evil dispositions which the head of his Church imputed to him held any place in his mind.

It was an evil time. Madame de Maintenon was ruled by Bissy, who had just obtained his cardinal's hat, with appointments sufficient to support the dignity. Saint Simon thinks he cannot better describe the severity exercised on those who could not accept the bull than by saying that it was modelled on the treatment of the Huguenots. The assembly of a national

council presented itself to many as the sole hope of peace, and this project was being discussed, with little hope of result, when everything came to a stand with the death of the king, 1st September 1715.[1]

The regency of a profligate, whose shameless orgies were proverbial, was not at first so formidable to religious liberty as the reign of a profligate making his repentance. De Noailles was favoured, and Tellier dismissed to die under the contempt of all parties, even his own,[2] the exiles recalled, and the only victims whom it was now impossible to compensate were the nuns of Port Royal, whose house had been destroyed. The regent imagined that peace could easily be restored,

[1] Von Dollinger has an essay, admirable in thought and temper, upon the policy of Louis XIV. The author's opinion on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes is epitomised in the following sentence :—"The chain of circumstances which followed the fatal 22nd of October, 1685, holds together link by link, leading up to the final annihilation of the lofty project of an European hegemony, or rather of an aristocratic monarchy." Upon the king's relations to the Church of France the author says :—"To the French Church, which the king had so highly esteemed and so carefully cherished, governing and administering her affairs with the best intentions, he bequeathed as a legacy that apple of discord, the bull *Unigenitus*, and the coercive means for its enforcement. By this the very vitals of the Gallican Church were poisoned, a lasting breach made between the clergy and laity, endless conflicts stirred up between the bishops and Parliaments and between the latter and the Cabinet, corruption and the germs of dissolution introduced into those ecclesiastical institutions which had been heretofore an ornament to the Church. The system of coercion and repression exercised henceforth by and over the clergy estranged them more and more from serious studies, causing them to shun knowledge, and reducing them to a state of intellectual impotence which rendered them utterly incapable of entering the lists in the literary contests, provoked by the powerful and aggressive adversaries of religion, which arose in the secular world." — Studies in European History, pp. 308, 319.

[2] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 232.

and made considerable efforts in that direction; but the only methods now open were that either the Pope should explain the bull, or that those who objected should be permitted to sign with explanations of their own. Both courses were obstinately opposed by the Jesuits and the Pope.

The regent wearied of the business, and was turning towards the party contented with the bull, as giving him less trouble, when four bishops of high character and intelligence took the decisive step of appealing in the matter to a general council. These brave prelates were De la Broue of Mirepoix, Soanen of Senez, Colbert of Montpellier, and Langle of Boulogne. They studiously concealed their project until they were able to make their appeal in the assembly of the Faculty of Theology, where it was received with enthusiasm.[1] Ninety-six doctors adhered to the appeal, twelve refused, and the veteran scholar, Du Pin, in giving his adhesion, declared that he had never read a document better drawn. The government was extremely displeased, and the appellants suffered severely; but the legality of the act could not be disputed, and it gave form and decision to the widespread opposition. The appellants had purposely abstained from informing De Noailles of their intention, but he himself lodged an appeal to the Pope better informed and a general council, in his registry, where for the present it remained secret, but became public after a time without his permission. Though the government feared the anger of the Pope, the result of the action of the four

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 235.

bishops was to spread alarm at Rome, and negotiations with Noailles were opened, during which silence was enjoined upon all parties by the government; but they came to nought.

The accusation of immoral tendency, which earnest men brought against the bull, received corroboration from the character of its chief advocates. Cardinals Rohan and Bissy were but poor examples of ecclesiastical life, far less reputable successors of Fenelon and Bossuet than the Georgian bishops were of Pearson and Taylor; but Dubois, the preceptor or corrupter of the regent d'Orleans, was vile in every relation. Yet his close connection with the regent made him a powerful friend in a time so critical, and he received a promise of the hat.[1] De Mailly and Tencin, who acquired the dignity at a later period, and for similar reasons, were of the like stamp. These were the creatures who disgraced the purple, while Clement XI., by the bull *Pastoralis Officii*, excommunicated the appellants, men of blameless life and doctrine. Saint Simon classes among the least creditable promotions that of Languet to the bishopric of Soissons, from which he afterwards passed to the archbishopric of Sens. He was the chief propagator of the visions of Mary Alacocque,[2] to which (with the help, it is said, of a theology derived originally from Goodwin, the English Puritan) the popular devotion of the Sacred Heart is due.

[1] See as to his ordination, and the refusal of De Noailles to forward it, Jervis, Church of France, ii. 243.

[2] In whose biography, says M. Martin, "Un homme d'intrigue nourri entre les Dubois et les Tencin a voulu singer la pieuse naiveté des légendaires."—*Hist. de France*, xv. 347.

The year 1720 saw a so-called accommodation, whereby an exposition of the bull was agreed on by theologians of both opinions. Noailles published a mandate of acceptance, and the regent issued letters patent for a new adoption of the constitution *Unigenitus*. The mandate, however, which Noailles put forth was very displeasing to the Pope, since it made mention of the five Gallican articles of 1682. The accommodation was no true solution of the difficulties.[1] The real subjects of disagreement were dissembled, and Clement XI. was about to proclaim its nullity when he died, and was succeeded by Innocent XIII.

This Pope was a friend of peace, and desired to preserve the illusion of agreement; but the clergy of Paris made protest in large numbers against the acceptance of the bull. The four appellant bishops declined to accede to the accommodation. A council of conscience, if the word conscience can be used of a committee composed of Cardinals Dubois, Rohan, Bissy, and the future Cardinal Fleury, were a veritable Inquisition, and punished even defective zeal for the bull. In such hard times, seven bishops had the courage to write to the new Pope a letter in which the history of the bull was given with caustic truthfulness, and his Holiness was urged to summon a general council to remedy all the evils which had sprung from *Unigenitus*.

This plainspeaking communication excited a tumult of anger at Rome. The Pope invoked the royal aid against the offenders, and the council decided to grant it. The seven bishops replied by such formidable

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 245.

proofs of the legitimacy of their action that they were left in peace. The ministry of Dubois, which occupied the closing months of the regency, saw a great abundance of other victims exiled or imprisoned for declining to sign the formula. Nuns were specially aimed at in this persecution. But the minister died in August 1723 a hopeless and faithless death, under an operation incurred by his excesses.[1] The regent lingered behind, his excellent abilities wrecked by his vices, but followed his tutor in December of the same year. Fleury conceded the post of prime minister to the Duke of Bourbon, but himself took the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. Whatever the innocence of his private life, and the merits he afterwards displayed in secular administration, he made himself in the business of the Church an instrument of the dominant faction—pledged thereto, it was thought, at his promotion to the sacred college.

The early part of 1724 saw a new Pope. Benedict XIII. was a Dominican, held the doctrine of S. Thomas, and had a high esteem for Cardinal de Noailles. There was reason to expect some aid for distressed consciences from him. De Noailles presented to him twelve articles containing the points on which he and his friends desired assurance, and they enable us to judge of the real questions at stake in this momentous controversy.

1. Since the fall of Adam none can receive true justification or salvation without faith in a Mediator and Redeemer, more or less developed and distinct according to the difference of times and persons. 2.

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, xv. 120.

The law of Moses did not give by its own proper virtues the grace necessary to fulfil the commandments of God. 3. None can resist the will of God. 4. In the fallen state it is not necessary that a man should have an equal faculty for good and evil, or an equal leaning to both sides, or equal powers of good and evil in his will in order to render his free will capable of being regarded as sinful or meritorious. 5. Many good theologians maintain, without danger of error, that the blind and the hardened are sometimes deprived of internal grace in punishment of past sin; but none maintain that those who, being deprived of grace, commit great sins, are not guilty before God. 6. The most important point in religion is the Divine commandment to love God, and this commandment is distinguished from all the rest. 7. Reference of all our acts to God is not merely a counsel, but a precept; and it is not enough that our acts may be interpreted as tending that way. 8. He who commits serious sins offends God, although he does not know Him, or does not actually think of Him, or does not pay express attention to the matter of the sin.[1] 9. They do not

[1] A book entitled "A Parallel of the Doctrine of the Pagans with the Doctrine of the Jesuits and that of the Constitution *Unigenitus*," translated from the French, was republished in Dublin (doubtless after London) 1716–17. It is a terrible indictment of the moral teaching of the society and of the bull *Unigenitus*, under various heads, with quotations under each of passages from heathen writers which display a morality far superior to the Jesuit. The author was a man both of learning and power, and it must have helped to feed the contempt of Irish Protestants for Irish Roman Catholics. But one may doubt whether the British world of the school of Hoadley, to whom the translation is dedicated, did not in many of the cases stated give its (practical) absolutions on as easy terms as the Jesuits.

follow the sure way of salvation who do not require, in the sacrament of penance, the same love of God which the second Council of Orange and the Council of Trent require of adults for justification in baptism. 10. It is in harmony with the Gospel and the rules of the Church to defer absolution in the case of penitents charged with great or public crimes, or of those who are in the habit, or even the close peril of mortal sin, or to those who refuse reconciliation, or will not make restitution, or defer these duties, or give but doubtful signs of sincere conversion, or neglect to learn the mysteries of the faith, or, in general, to any whom a wise confessor does not judge to be sufficiently disposed and prepared. 11. The reading of Holy Scripture is useful beyond doubt in itself, but is not necessary for salvation in the case of all without exception. Individuals are not permitted to expound it at their fancy and will, nor to read without preserving the respect and obedience due to pastors, or without sincere submission to the spirit of the Church, whose business it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture. 12. If any sentence of excommunication forbids us to exercise an act of virtue, or turns us from a true precept, it should be regarded as invalid and unjust, and not in conformity with the decrees of the Church.

These articles enable us to see that whether Jansenism was right or wrong as to the "fact of Jansenius," and whether its existence was consistent or not with Roman Catholic discipline, its spiritual principles as shown in its best members were worthy of all respect,

being, in truth, evangelicalism in its true sense. The articles were submitted to the Pope, who replied to the archbishop's agent in the following terms, "I have read with all possible attention the propositions which you have presented to me in the name of the Cardinal de Noailles. I find them sound, true, and Catholic; so much so that if the Cardinal had written to me I should have instantly sent him a brief to content him as to these propositions. But as he has not yet written to me on this subject, direct him, from me, to write as soon as possible, and insert in his letter the propositions as you have presented them to me." But the Pope, though an autocrat, was himself under rule. The brief was not written, the affair was referred to a commission, a packet of letters arrived from France which "diffused horror," and the Pope was advised not to make his peace with Noailles lest the bishops of France should protest against the act and a schism ensue. And instead of the approval of his propositions which Noailles had expected, a draft pastoral drawn up by the Inquisition arrived from Rome for his signature.

It was not signed; nor was the signature of Noailles ever truly obtained to any acceptance, pure and simple, of the bull. His character was naturally weak, but God granted to his uprightness and humility strength to resist the sinful compliance to which he was tempted. His chaplain Dorsanne, a priest of much power, was taken from his side by a death which bore strong marks of poison. The old man, as death approached, subscribed once and again forms of submission pressed

upon him by his brother cardinals, Fleury, Bissy, and Rohan. But these acts lost all worth when an affecting document was produced, executed after the first of these signatures and renewed after the second, in which the archbishop described himself as torn between the love of truth and the desire for peace, and begged that no value should be attached to any contradiction of his life-long testimony which might be wrung from his weakness.[1]

More cruel still was the persecution[2] exercised upon Soanen, Bishop of Senez, who had arrived at the age of eighty, and was universally regarded as one of the saintliest bishops of France. This prelate refused to believe that the bull *Unigenitus* had abolished the peace of Clement IX. But Tencin of Embrun, his metropolitan, obtained leave to hold a provincial council, a worthy and ancient custom revived for a sinister purpose. Before this tribunal the aged bishop was tried with unseemly and uncanonical haste, deprived of the help of his theologians, and in spite of his appeal to the Pope and a general council, suspended from his office. His appeal to the Parliament *comme d'abus* was disposed of by Fleury, who called the case before the council, and the old man was exiled to a monastery.

These severities had their effect in alarming the bishops, and the French episcopate accepted without any adequate protest the injustice inflicted on a member of their body; but the royal authority, which thus placed itself at the disposal of the Papacy, and the

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 269. [2] Ibid., 262.

Papacy, which thus submitted to use the secular power in ecclesiastical affairs, found themselves opposed by the Parliament in a struggle which was only terminated by the precipitation of all three together into the gulf of the Revolution. The prime minister, Fleury, took up the seemingly Erastian position of refusing to regard the bull *Unigenitus* as a rule of faith, while determining to make it a law of the State. It was for the latter purpose that the king held a bed of justice to enforce the registration of the bull. The Parliament resented the interference, and regarded this enforced recognition as of no legal effect. Consequently, when three priests appealed *comme d'abus* from the sentence of their "constitutionist" bishop, the Parliament pronounced in favour of their appeal, while forty advocates of the Paris bar signed an opinion in favour of the decision. The matter was transferred to the council, and the lawyers were punished. They made their peace with the royal authority, but maintained their position that the reception of the bull by the bishops was illegal.

Similar measures were held with the Faculty of Theology to compel it to reverse its adhesion to the appeal of the four bishops to a general council. This reversal was effected by the operation of *lettres de cachet*, which removed all the appellant doctors from their functions. The expelled doctors appealed to the Parliament, but the remnant who were left voted all the necessary steps for the adoption of the constitution *Unigenitus*.

The Parliament undertook another controversy with the court of Rome on the subject of the legend of Pope

Gregory VII. A special office in commemoration of that illustrious asserter of Papal claims was solemnly authorised at Rome, and the day of the festival fixed for May 25th; but it was suspected in France, both by the Gallican bishops and by the Parliament, that this new-found zeal for a saint of the Middle Ages was but an excuse to cover the ultramontane teaching for which such an office gave excellent opportunity. The king ordered the bishops to describe *Unigenitus* not as a rule of faith, but as a dogmatic decision of the universal Church. No one greatly regarded the direction, and the assembly of clergy in 1730 renewed their assent to the Articles of 1682; yet we can plainly discern the disfavour into which Gallicanism had fallen through its supposed alliance with Jansenism.[1]

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 278.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE REVOLUTION.

Miracles at the tomb of the Abbé Paris—Denial of the Sacraments to Jansenists—Le Courayer and the Church of England—Advance of philosophy — Expulsion of the Jesuits — The Revolution — Attitude of the clergy—Confiscation of Church property—The civil constitution—Bishop Gregoire.

BUT the hand of Heaven seemed to interpose in favour of the proscribed faith. In the year 1727 the Deacon Paris died, and was buried in the cemetery of S. Medard. In close concealment in the heart of the city, he had lived the life of an early anchoret. His property had been surrendered to his brother. His time was passed in making stockings for the poor, and in study and meditation of the Bible. Some time after his death miracles were believed to be wrought at his tomb, and, as he had been during his life an appellant against *Unigenitus*, these portents were regarded as declarations from God in favour of Jansenism. The same difficulty of belief which the secular world displays in the case of Lourdes and Knock was on this occasion witnessed in ultramontanes. The testimony of the miracles at S. Medard is carefully estimated by Paley; but the crowd had no doubt, and enthusiasm passed into those convulsive phenomena which have so often been witnessed in times of religious

excitement; for instance, in the Ulster Revivals of the year 1857.

Some excellent members of the school of Port Royal declared themselves for the divine origin of these symptoms, but the large majority of these divines were in strong opposition to the movement.[1] Jansenism can with no manner of justice be identified with Convulsionism, which was simply the excess into which the more ignorant of the school were driven by persecution. A physician of the name of Hecquet, of the school of Port Royal, published a work at the time, in which he propounded the theory which his profession agrees to give of later miraculous signs, maintaining with great learning that those in question were true, but natural in their origin. So far from producing impressions favourable to Jansenism in the minds of its enemies, these miracles aroused them to greater violence, and we now begin to hear of the refusal of the Sacraments and of Christian burial to appellants, unless billets of confession could be produced to show that they had been reconciled before death; but these cruel excesses, supported as they were by the king, brought renewed

[1] A book published (without place) in 1753, entitled *La Constitution Unigenitus, Addressée a un Laique de Province*, makes a despairing attempt to help a layman in the country whose bishop and clergy have gone with the tide. He is to supply their place by a constant study of Holy Scripture, the works of the Fathers, and the books of Port Royal (p. 37). He is to remember that the bull cannot be said to have been received by the Church because a mass of signatures have been appended to it; until it has been weighed fully and deliberately by the bishops as independently as if they had been in council (pp. 73–75), and appeal is made to miracles which God has wrought during a number of years by the intervention of His servants who died in attachment to the appeal of the four bishops (p. 136).

conflict with the Parliaments. The refusal of the Sacraments and of burial in consecrated ground was a civil proceeding as well as an ecclesiastical, and the magistrates were bound to determine whether it rested on legal grounds. It was a plain offence against the law to justify the refusal upon the ground of an appeal by the victim from the Pope to a general council, a proceeding recognised by French law as perfectly legitimate.

A great number of the persecuted party abandoned their country for Holland. The succession of the ancient bishops elected in that country was under condemnation at Rome for refusing to accept the *Unigenitus*, and descend to the position of vicars apostolic nominated by the Pope. The Church of Holland thus became Jansenist, and separate from Rome, and has furnished consecration to the bishops of the Old Catholics of our own time. These conflicts with national and individual liberty leave on us the impression that it is impossible to concede to the Papacy so much as Gallicanism gave to it, without securing its future advance to so much more as will sooner or later destroy the liberties which Gallicanism claimed. This destruction began in the eighteenth century, and has been concluded in the nineteenth. Bossuet, along with many corruptions of primitive Christianity, held a great mass of noble and Catholic truth. He could not keep it free from the despotic hands of Rome except by the help of the royal power; but the royal power not only made gross infringements on Catholic rules for itself, but was too capable, as the event showed, of placing its most tyrannical claims at the disposal of the Pope.

Finally, the royal power was but earthly; it disappeared. There is no possibility of keeping alive the principles of Gallicanism except in some Church to which God's Providence has assigned a position of more definite independence of Rome than the French possessed. The true heir of Gallicanism is the Church of England.

If it were in our power to treat the liturgical history of the French Church, we should here describe the considerable numbers of reformed breviaries issued for the dioceses of France, especially the amendments in that of Paris conducted by de Harlay, de Noailles, and Vintimille. The later prelate conceived the interesting idea of using the psalter in the order of devotional ideas, gathering the psalms which embody one leading thought for use in each service. But this subject, refreshing as it is in the midst of miserable controversies, could not be treated by us.

One of the rare names in our history which recall ideas of Catholic reform is that of Père le Courayer.[1] This learned priest published in 1723 the well-known dissertation on the "Validity of English Ordinations." He maintained the affirmative of this important question, the negative of which, though habitually acted

[1] The story of the correspondence between M. Dupin and Archbishop Wake, with a view to a union between the Gallican and Anglican Churches, will be found related in Perry's History of the Church of England, iii. 31 *et seq.*, and his Students' Church of England, iii. 45 *et seq.*, and 57. It was the origin of Le Courayer's inquiries into our ordinal. Tournely of the Sorbonne replied to Courayer (*De Ordine*, Paris, 1729), relying chiefly (p. 48) upon the interference of the English king with the affairs of the Church—precarious ground for a Gallican, especially one who had lived under Louis XIV.

on by the Roman Church, has never been definitely decided at Rome, and as Canon Estcourt, one of the latest and fairest Roman writers, declares, will probably be never settled there at all. Le Courayer met with much opposition, but defended his thesis in a second work. He has never been answered, and his two books are well worth the study even of English historians. He maintained advanced opinions upon other matters of Roman theology, and translated into French, with valuable notes, the "History of the Council of Trent," by Fra Paolo Sarpi; but neither Jansenist nor Jesuits would touch such dangerous subjects. It is to be feared that Le Courayer himself, like Blanco White in later days, was betrayed into Arianism.

Even the Jesuits were not exempt from the restless spirit of the time, and Père Berruyer, in his "History of the People of God," advanced free views upon Holy Scripture. The work of the Jesuit Pichon gave immense offence in many quarters. It was entitled "The Spirit of Jesus Christ and the Church on Frequent Communion," and it maintained that of all ways appointed in the Gospel for salvation, frequent communion was the most effectual. To abstain from mortal sin was sufficient qualification, and those who fell into mortal sin must hasten to confess and be absolved, that they may not miss the earliest opportunity of the great means of grace. This book was plainly intended as a correction of the work of Arnauld upon "Frequent Communion," in which the necessity of delay and proof of repentance was upheld. Doubtless Père Pichon departed from the idea of the primitive Church, yet perhaps not so far as those in

his own Church and in Christian bodies of a very opposite character, who regard the Holy Eucharist as intended for widely separated occasions rather than as daily bread. The Jesuits defended Pichon with their usual *esprit de corps*.

While the forces of the Church were thus divided, philosophy was advancing with long and rapid strides. Voltaire, like Renan, was educated among the clergy; but the recollections of the clergy which the two heresiarchs carried from their youth were different indeed. Voltaire's Abbé de Château-Neuf was an infidel and a teacher of vice; Renan finds nothing to remember in the clerical friends of his youth but earnestness and devotion. It is significant likewise to contrast the spirit of the two infidelities. The one, contemptuous and utterly negative, proceeds to assured victory over a despicable enemy; the other, patronising and tender, gathers every shred of gospel story for its exquisite picture. Unbelief has found it impossible to crush the faith, and assumes the mask of a friend.

It is agreed that the beginnings of French infidelity had their origin in England. If the French Church had been so much truer to Christ's institution as it supposed, one would have expected from it a more successful war against the enemy than its neighbour could wage. The fact was quite otherwise. The English Church, with all its many defects, overcame English deism; and, moreover, the religious defence in England produced at least one epoch-making book in Butler's "Analogy." The splendid provision of talent which the Church of France possessed, marshalled and

inspired upon the system which we are told is alone divine, was lamentably defeated not only in the field of material events, but in that of spiritual supremacy. English deists indeed, except Hume, were a dull race, and the French philosophers the most brilliant men of the time; but how came religion in England to hold the best intellect of the country, and in France to lose it? True also that religion in France was weighted by alliance with a bad temporal government; but while the State in England doubtless did its duty as a state better than the State in France, nothing could well be worse than its influence upon religion and the Church. In this department it gave hindrance, not help.

Before the Revolution burst upon France the Jesuits, who had done so much to prepare for it, had encountered a storm of their own, and were out of the way. The enmity which they had accumulated by their proceedings in religion was no doubt the chief cause of their fall, and indeed if they could have modified their religious organisation they might have escaped. But the immediate occasion was secular; their too great aptitude for the world and its business betrayed them. We need not tell the story of the bankruptcy of Père Lavalette, which is found in every secular history. Strange to say, it was caused by the capture of merchant vessels by English ships of war; the heretic islanders had their share in the calamity of their implacable enemies. We cannot possibly lament the legal decision which made the society liable for the debts of its member. If he had traded successfully, the profits would have been for his society, not

himself. Nor did he engage in trade without its full authority and example; it was therefore just that it should accept the risk.

The French bishops, most of whom owed their position to the Jesuits, gave them their support; one prelate alone, Fitzjames of Soissons, dared to pronounce for their suppression. The king, with so much episcopal encouragement, ventured to oppose the Parliament, and to press for the maintenance of the order on condition of its subjection in France to a vicar-general nominated by the crown.[1] But the general of the Jesuits would not divide his vast monarchy. Doubtless he felt that such a concession would have been a transgression of his vows, and he made the often-quoted reply, "*Sint ut sunt aut non sint.*" For the time the result was ruin not only in France but at Rome. We should have been forced to pity the expulsion of so many devoted workers, diligent educationists, and self-denying guides of souls, if we could forget the unrelenting hardness of their conduct to others, and the unscrupulous use of secular power which they made in their day of prosperity. The enactment by which the Jesuit institute was abolished in France declared it inadmissible by its nature in every organised state, contrary to natural law, opposed to every authority, temporal and spiritual, and tending to establish in churches and in states under the specious veil of a religious institution, not an order aspiring at evangelical perfection alone, but rather a political body, the

[1] But the society was out of favour at court for a creditable cause; the insistence of the Jesuit confessors of the king and Madame de Pompadour upon a total separation. Jervis, Church of France, ii. 345.

essence of which consists in ceaseless activity for the purpose of arriving by all sorts of ways, direct or indirect, secret or political, first at absolute independence, and then at the usurpation of all authority.[1]

Clement XIII. addressed briefs of congratulation to the bishops who had supported the order; but these briefs were suppressed by Parliament, and the Pope was restrained from further expressions of his indignation by the warnings of Cardinal Ganganelli that in the present temper of France he might easily produce a schism. The regrets of the bishops for the catastrophe were not shared by the inferior clergy, and there cannot be a doubt that the suppression was popular. The plots of statesmen, to which the priests themselves attributed their misfortune, counted for little, even if they existed.

The suppression of the order in France was a prelude to its extinction by the Pope. The French ministers were urgent for the measure, and Ganganelli, now Pope Clement XIV., was himself convinced of the necessity of it. But it was dangerous; there is good evidence that the Pope feared poison. He moved with caution and delay, but upon July 21, 1773, the brief *Dominus et Redemptor Noster*, which suppressed the famous society, was signed.

This event preceded by less than a year the accession of Louis XVI., who, if he had not the saintly qualities of S. Louis nor the intellectual powers which other kings of his line possessed, was yet free from the boundless sensuality and the unrelenting tyranny

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 355.

which so many of them exercised. Yet it was upon him that the wrath which they had treasured up fell in the day of slaughter. With the approach of the Revolution, the depressed religious interests began to struggle. The assembly of clergy in 1775 called the attention of the king to the progress of Protestantism, which in the midst of its ruin preserved its spirit of independence. We learn, indeed, that Protestantism was in the opinion of the clergy spreading widely, and members of the sect were admitted to many offices forbidden to them by the law. This fact might have been well endured, upon reflecting that Protestantism was better than infidelity. And perhaps it was this consideration, or else the knowledge that in the state of the public mind prosecution was impossible, which hindered the clergy from asking for any measures more violent than the extension in Dauphiné, Languedoc, and Guienne of the monetary inducements offered to converts from Protestantism.

Another despised class of whom we have heard but little among the controversies and the politics of the past, was the humble clergy of the Church of France itself. The curates, as we should term them, performed the work for which more fortunate men were paid. The poverty of this class in England hardly equalled that of France, where a *congruiste* or *locum tenens*, so called from receiving a fit or congruous part of the income, was paid on the eve of the Revolution 500 francs a year, and a *vicaire*, or curate, 200. Such men had little to fear and much to hope from a Revolution.

The States-General met in 1789. The ecclesiastics

who took part in this memorable Parliament, displayed a very different spirit from the traditional opposition to reform. The clergy of the second order knew the wants of the people from whom they sprang, and sympathised deeply with them. The mind which conceived the plan by which the Tiers-Etat of the States-General passed into the National Assembly was that of the Abbé Siéyes, and the process of gradual filtration whereby the clerical deputies identified themselves by threes and sixes, and at last by a majority, with the representatives of the people, was the first stage of the Revolution. The great body of the clergy were present, and kept their seats when Mirabeau dismissed De Brêzé to tell his master that they were present by the will of the people, and refused to dissolve. But a few days after, the venerable Archbishop of Paris presented himself in the Assembly with touching words of peace and charity, and the president Bailly responded in the same tone. The clerical minority, in company with their brethren of the nobles, finally united themselves with the National Assembly, but only upon the command of the king.

It was a hopeful beginning; but the folly of the court on the one hand in massing troops around the Assembly, and on the other the machinations of violent spirits instigated and hired by the Duke of Orleans, who hoped to ride on the wave of Revolution, prevented the peaceful development of the mighty change. The Bastille was no subject of regret to religious people. But the destruction of S. Lazare, the establishment of S. Vincent de Paul, with all its manifold depart-

ments for the relief of the poor and the elevation of spiritual life, was a horror and a mystery. The humble cell of the saint himself had nothing in it that recalled tyranny or aristocracy. Yet it was pillaged, and the simple relics scattered—the bed of straw, the iron candlestick, the old man's staff. Some wild suspicion, perfectly false, that the Lazarists had been storing corn in the midst of the scarcity, was the only pretext for this accursed act.

The clergy took their full and willing share in the surrender of ancient privileges for the national good. The tithes were placed in the hands of the nation by the clergy of the Assembly; the Archbishop of Paris and the curés vying in patriotic enthusiasm. Even the principle of religious liberty in its widest form was adopted upon the motion of Mirabeau; a more difficult conquest over the prepossessions of the clergy of France than deprivation of their property implied. But in spite of all their self-denial, the unpopularity of the clergy with the populace of Paris grew and increased. The whole body were visited for the indolence and vice of the court prelates. The Abbé Gregoire, himself an enthusiastic revolutionist and friend of the people, warned the Assembly, before moving from Versailles to Paris, to consider carefully the dangers of the operation, and provide special means for the protection of its clerical members. The revolution held its way, and the renunciation of the tithes was followed by the alienation of all ecclesiastical property to national uses, leaving the clergy dependent upon the nation for their daily bread.

The debates by which this sweeping measure was carried, and the Church of France reconstituted upon a basis framed in the National Assembly, are of extreme interest to the members of a Church which has gone through the process of disestablishment, or apprehends the possibility of such a fate. The glaring defects of the Church of France, together with the revolutionary spirit of the Assembly, doubtless delivered her into the hand of her enemies. But the question of National Endowments was argued from its basis, and the reconstitution of the establishment was carefully framed and included some provisions worthy of admiration. It is remarkable how completely absent from every mind was the conception of a free church in a free state. It occurs to none that the Church should be set free, either with or without a part of its former wealth, to arrange its affairs for itself. Siéyes, indeed, proposed to endow the Church instead of paying its clergy from State funds, but he met no support. Also, we are struck by the absence of any tinge of Protestantism in the debates. Once, Robespierre introduced the question of the marriage of priests, but he was speedily silenced, and none renewed his attempt.

The motion of alienation was made by Talleyrand-Perigord, who at that stage of his versatile career was Bishop of Autun. The revenues of the Church from land had been seventy millions, from tithes eighty millions of francs. The clergy numbered eighty thousand, half of which number had, as Talleyrand acknowledged, a right to look forward to the process of national revolution as an amelioration of their lot.

"They had deserved so well of men, and were so useful to society, that the nation must desire to secure and amend their condition; they must have on the average at least 1200 francs per annum besides lodging; others must have more." The scheme proposed to rearrange the work of the Church and compensate it on this modest scale, and with the vast capitalised value of its possessions to pay the debts of the State and repair the national bankruptcy. The debate concluded on November 2, 1789, by a division in which 568 voted for the declaration that the ecclesiastical endowments belonged to the nation, charged with the duty of providing for religion, and 346 gave their voices on the other side.[1] On the 20th of the same month the blow was followed up by a decree to sell four hundred millions of the property.

The Assembly declined a proposition to give a portion of the clerical pittance in land. It seemed bent upon making the clergy paid officials of the State, even at the moment that the profession of a State religion was abolished. The consequence to the independence of the priesthood has been mischievous to a degree. At the same time, the Assembly resolved that it did not recognise perpetual vows, and consequently abolished religious orders. Those famous societies, so full of great recollections, and still capable of new life, disappeared amidst the storm. The acquisition of the property of the Church was a pressing necessity. But there was a greater necessity to arrange her new place. "For these politicians, new to their power, it

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 399.

was more important," says M. Taine,[1] "to apply a principle than to cover the deficit." The principle in question has ever ruled in systematic and logical France; Richelieu and Louis XIV. obeyed it when they persecuted the Protestants, and the Republic of the present day obey it in persecuting the Church. The Church itself half confesses the principle by its inability to accept the position of an independent society and be a free church in a free state. Mirabeau laid it down by saying that "particular societies placed in the general society break the unity of its principles and the equilibrium of its forces." The Archbishop of Aix offered to pay three hundred and sixty millions of debt by a loan raised by the Church herself, upon her own property and by her own credit, which was far better than that of the State. But the Assembly preferred to follow out its principle by remodelling the Church and seizing the property, which could not be turned into money with sufficient rapidity except in the form of paper. Under the form of paper the goods of the Church became depreciated to nothing, and vanished with little service to anybody.

With the confiscation of the goods of the clergy emigration received an impulse. There were certain cases—like that of the Archbishop of Paris—in which emigration was unavoidable by reason of the danger which threatened at home. Yet there was no necessity for departure from the country at large; and sore as would have been the humiliation for the wealthy beneficed priest to have performed his ministry on a salary

[1] *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*, i. 221.

FRANCE
Divided
Into Dioceses
IN THE 18th CENTURY.
ENGLAND
ENGLISH CHANNEL
BELGIUM
SWITZERLAND
BAY OF BISCAY
SPAIN
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
Pyrenees Mts
FLANDRES
Ypres
Boulogne
St Omer
Lille
Arras
Cambrai
PICARDIE
Amiens
Arras
CHAMPAGNE
Rheims
Verdun
Metz
Rouen
Vexin
Bayeux
Evreux
NORMANDY
PARIS
Orleans
LORAINE
Toul
Nancy
Strasbourg
Avranches
Fougeres
Sees
Treguier
BRETAGNE
Quimper
MAINE
LeMans
ORLEANOIS
GATINOIS
Langres
Auxerre
Vannes
Blois
ANJOU
Tours
Nantes
TOURAINE
BERRY
BOURGOGNE
FRANCHE COMTE
Besançon
Autun
Chalon
POITOU
Poitiers
Lucon
MARCHE
Macon
SAINTONGE
Angoulême
Limoges
LIMOSIN
Tulle
Clermont
AUVERGNE
Forez
Lyon
LYONOIS
SAVOYE
Vienne
PERIGORD
Perigueux
Bordeaux
GUYENNE
Basas
Cahors
Rhodez
QUERCY
ROUERGUE
Mende
Cevenes
Flour
Velay
DAUPHINE
Gap
Embrun
Arles
Avignon
Montpellier
Riez
Grasse
PROVENCE
Dax
GASCOGNE
Bayonne
Lescar
Tarbe
Toulouse
LANGUEDOC
Narbonne
Perpignan
Marseille
Toulon
4°
2°
0
2°
4°
6°
52°
50°
48°
46°
44°
42°

from the civil service, it had been better for him to have accepted the slight.

The Pope regarded the progress of the Revolution with silent dismay. He accorded to the bishops the power to relieve of their vows those regulars who desired to abandon them. But he and his court regarded the spoliation of the goods of the Church as a declaration against religion on the part of the Assembly. It had not yet come to that. The great ceremony of the Feast of the Federation was celebrated in Christian form, when Talleyrand said Mass at the national altar in the Champ de Mars in presence of 400,000 spectators. But the nobles and the higher clergy stood aloof, and the people responded with hatred to these and all institutions identified with them.

The Assembly proceeded with the civil constitution of the clergy. It was founded upon the civil divisions now established.[1] Each of the eighty-three departments was a bishopric; the archbishoprics were ten. All foreign authority is repudiated. Bishops and parish priests are alike to be appointed by election. The bishop must have served in the diocese for fifteen years as priest. The metropolitan gives institution after examining into the doctrine and life of the elect. He must demand no pledge except a profession of the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion. No confirmation must be asked from the Pope, but a letter may be written to him as visible head of the Church on earth, in testimony of unity of faith and communion. The

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 400 *et seq.*

parish priests are elected by the same constituency as the administrative assembly of the district. A parish priest must have been curate or chaplain for five years. The highest income in the Church is that of the Archbishop of Paris at 50,000 francs. Other bishops are salaried according to the population subject to them, and the lowest episcopal income is 12,000 francs. The salaries of priests range from 6000 francs for some cathedral dignitaries and the parish priests of Paris, down to 1200 for country incumbents, and then downward to 700 francs a year for the curate of a country parish. Aged priests unable to discharge their duty can have an extra curate at the expense of the State, or, should they prefer it, liberty to retire with a pension equal to what this curate would have cost.

The discussion upon this scheme called out interesting opinions. The principle which separated the two classes of reasoners was that to some the new division of dioceses by the civil power seemed to be an interference with the spiritual work of the Church, while others regarded it as a purely secular act. It was shown that the boundaries of dioceses had largely followed the civil divisions of the country. But this did not persuade the great body of churchmen. They believed that in exercising the functions of bishops or priests in districts assigned by merely civil authority, the clergy would be acting without jurisdiction. It is certain, however, that up to the period of the Concordat of Bologna, jurisdiction was conferred in France by the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops. The Assembly

declared that their project in no wise touched the unity of the faith or the communion which they desired to maintain with the Supreme Pontiff. The Abbé Gregoire touched a point of importance when he objected to the election of bishops by the same constituencies as the civil officers, and proposed that non-Catholics should be prohibited from taking part in it. But it was replied that the election was to be after Mass, at which the electors were bound to attend, and that no farther test could be imposed without an inquisition into opinions contrary to the spirit of the times.

The Pope watched the proceedings of the Assembly with anxious interest, and in two briefs he warned the king that a secular body could have no authority to alter the discipline and doctrine of the Church. These briefs were not made known, and the king sanctioned the civil constitution of the clergy. The new system was imposed under the sanction of an oath of assent, with deprivation as a penalty for refusal; and Mirabeau thundered against the abuses of the ancient system, and the scandalous and impure interest to which so many of the bishops owed their places. "I will maintain," he cried, "that prelates whose creation is thus anti-canonical, who have entered the fold of the Lord by so profane a door, are the real intruders whom religion condemns, and cannot without an offence to all shame oppose the law which gives them for successors men who have obtained the esteem, ever impartial and pure, of their fellow-citizens."

The Archbishop of Aix drew up and published an "Exposition of Principles on the Civil Constitution,"

which set forth that the civil authority cannot without concurrence of the ecclesiastical determine affairs of a mixed nature, where spiritual interests are involved with temporal. This formula obtained the signature of ninety-seven bishops; Talleyrand of Autun, and Gobel of Lydda *in partibus*, alone refused their adhesion. The general movement of the higher ecclesiastics against the constitution was more than individuals could resist, and it appeared in no long time that the two who stood out were men destitute of faith. Among the inferior clergy, however, there were many Constitutionalists upon whom no stigma of unbelief or even indifference could be fixed, yet who accepted the new scheme. Gregoire, in taking the oath, claimed that the Assembly had never offered the slightest injury to dogma, to the hierarchy, or the spiritual authority of the Pope,[1] and that the very term, "civil constitution of the clergy," proved its intention to be limited to civil affairs. But, replied the Bishop of Clermont, we have always acknowledged that our religious functions are limited to the territory for which we have received our mission from the ecclesiastical authority.

Cardinal de Brienne, one of the bishops who took the oath and retained his see, wrote to the Pope to explain his motives. The Pope replied by a vehement invective, in which he denounced the conduct of the cardinal as a stain upon the purple, and a detestable crime. De Brienne replied that he had not known, in accepting the purple, that it bound him to disobedience to the laws of his country, and resigned his dignity.

[1] Jervis, Church of France, ii. 405.

Among the bishops appointed under the constitution was Gregoire, who was elected in two sees but chose that of Loire et Cher, the seat of which was Blois, and devoted himself with energy to his duties. The country was occupied without delay by the new network of ecclesiastical organisation. It had to perform its functions under the condemnation of the Pope, who annulled the elections of the constitutional bishops, and suspended Talleyrand and Gobel. And in every diocese nonjuring priests made their rounds, in disguise or by night, to baptize the young or to console the dying.

Gregoire, the most conspicuous figure among the constitutional clergy, was vehemently republican as well as sincerely religious. Such a combination of opinions is comprehensible at the present time, when the Pope himself has recommended conformity to a republican government. A hundred years ago, it seemed a monstrous inconsistency; especially when carried to the excess, from which the enthusiast Gregoire did not shrink, of advocating the abolition of royalty, and even approving, though he did not vote for, the death of the king.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE EMPIRE AND THE CONCORDAT.

The Legislative Assembly—Massacre and exile of clergy—The Convention—Public atheism—The Goddess of Reason—Return to theism—Fête of the Supreme Being—Exertions of the constitutional clergy—Theophilanthropism—Observance of Decadi—Napoleon and Pius VII.—Negotiations—Deprivation of bishops—Concordat of 1801—Organic articles—Spiritual assumptions of the emperor—Resistance of the Pope.

THE Legislative Assembly went far beyond its predecessor in irreligion; the civil constitution would not have been carried in it. Atheism was openly professed in debate, and the constitutional bishops who sat in the Assembly had on the one hand to defend their faith, and on the other to face the reproach which participation in such debates brought with it. The king declined to assent to a decree for taking severe measures against the non-jurors; but his courage had the ill-effect of exciting the royalist clergy to renewed agitations. The Pope intervened with a brief, in which the clergy who had taken the oaths were threatened with excommunication. On the 27th May 1792, the Assembly adopted a decree that non-juring priests, condemned to exile, should quit France on pain of ten years' imprisonment. The king hesitated, but could not persuade himself to sanction the measure, and Roland, his Minister of the Interior, resigned

under the persuasion that, in default of such a law, the departments would act against the clergy for themselves, and the people would commit excesses. His presages were verified, and the prisons were crowded with priests.

The appalling massacres of September 2nd fell heavily upon the priests, of whom 140 were murdered at the Carmes alone. "Give thanks to God, gentlemen," said the Archbishop of Arles, "that He calls us to seal with our blood the faith we profess: let us ask of Him the grace of final perseverance, which by our own merits we could not obtain." Whatever defects the French clergy displayed in prosperity, they suffered, whether as martyrs or as exiles, with the patient faith of Christians, and with the chivalrous grace which belongs to their nation at its best.

The Legislative Assembly struck a tremendous blow at French religion and charity, when it abolished in one fell decree the congregations which saintly people had founded for every object of benevolence and piety. The very nurses of the hospitals and instructors of the poor were disbanded in spite of the eloquent protests of Le Coz, the constitutional Bishop of Ille. And for the more complete abolition of all that could suggest ecclesiasticism, the use of religious costume was suppressed, and the marriage of the clergy was permitted.

To the Legislative Assembly succeeded the Convention, in which seventeen constitutional bishops took their seats. Four of them voted for the king's death. Gregoire, their leading spirit, would have done so, had

he held it consistent with his episcopal character to sanction bloodshed. The oath to the civil constitution was superseded by one of equality and fraternity, and the excesses of the Revolution drove many constitutionalists to retract. Priests of every opinion perished in troops. Those who had passed the frontier in obedience to the decree of the Legislative Assembly, or who fled from the persecution, were charitably welcomed in foreign lands, but most of all in England and in Ireland, where the Huguenots had found refuge before them.[1]

A sadder recollection than the sufferings of this multitude were the apostasies, whether caused by cowardly subservience or by the frantic enthusiasm of irreligion which had become epidemic. The wretched Gobel, constitutional Bishop of Paris, renounced his faith at the bar of the Convention with his grand vicars and some other priests. Amidst the degrading scene Gregoire stood firm, and in spite of the frantic Assembly, which he compares to Milton's parliament of devils, he made proclamation of his faith. The number of apostates was considerable, and about two thousand broke their vows of celibacy. The ghastly farce of enthroning a ballet dancer in Notre Dame as the Goddess of Reason, proves that a kind of general madness, such as Bishop Butler conceived to be imaginable, had seized the nation. It spread through France, and every village had its goddess, until in June 1794 Robespierre, himself a deist of the

[1] See Barruel, *Histoire du Clerge pendant la Revolution Françoise. Ouvrage dedie a la nation Angloise. Londres,* 1793.

school of Rousseau, moved the decree which asserted the existence of the Supreme Being. The reaction against the vile nature-worship which profaned the name of reason served him in the destruction of his rivals; the deist was the guiding spirit of the Reign of Terror. But the Fête of the Supreme Being, when the image of atheism was solemnly burnt before an immense crowd in the Champ de Mars, was an imposing proof of the returning power of religion at the prompting of the human heart, and under no compulsion of either priest or tyrant.

After the fall of Robespierre, the Convention decreed a general toleration, and withdrawal of government assistance from all religions whatever. The pensions already pledged were maintained, but the cessation of dependence on the part of the working clergy of the constitutional section, gave a great impulse to their zeal and to the respect with which they were viewed. An extensive and genuine work of religious reparation began, which realised in some small degree the conception of a free church in a free state. In the restoration of free worship Gregoire took a noble part. He denounced from the tribune the miserable apostates as men who claimed favour on the ground of confessing they had lived lives of hypocrisy. His pastoral letter re-establishing worship in his diocese was sold at the very doors of the Convention.

Encyclicals from many bishops of France, addressed to the other bishops and the vacant churches, were issued by the influence of Gregoire and Desbois, Bishop

of La Somme, and served as pastorals for those prelates who could not command sufficient funds to print their own. A Society of Christian Philosophy, and a journal entitled *Annales de Religion*, were founded by the same indefatigable worker as a counterpoise to the prevalent unbelief, and an encouragement to the dispirited clergy persecuted by the Revolution and rejected by Rome. Gregoire complains bitterly that the friends of the non-juring clergy were in many cases persecutors of the Constitutionals and destroyers of their churches. The throne and the altar were so united in their thought, that they could not tolerate submission to a republican government. No doubt the Constitutionals had accepted many things inconsistent with the spiritual claims of Rome, as well as with the ancient secular privileges of their Church. Still, if Rome in 1794 had severed herself from political preference as she has done in 1892, and allowed her children to accept the government which the nation desired, the fate of the Church in France might possibly have been different. She might have been free and national; her bishops might not have been chosen for her by unbelieving rulers, or have made her the instrument of a selfish despot's ambition, and free offerings might have enabled her, as they have enabled so many denominations in various lands, much poorer than France, to dispense with a pittance from the State.

Among the signs of life which the independent Church of France displayed, were two national councils. The first was held in the year 1797 in the face of a hostile government, and its first care was to seek reconcilia-

tion with the Pope and with the bishops of the old *régime*. Their explanation of the position of their Church was to quote from a brief which the Pope himself had issued, the apostolic principle that there is no power but of God, and to resist the power is to resist the ordinance of God. "Scrupulously attached," they proceed, "to this Evangelical morality, we could not help taking in 1791 the oath which the law prescribed and which charity commended to us. In what peril should we not have placed our souls and those of our countrymen by refusing. By this refusal the exercise of the priesthood was abolished in France; the faithful were deprived of the ministrations of the Church; nor was this all; some men had formed the impious project of expelling Catholicism from France. By obeying and submitting to the law we disappointed the infernal plan, and succeeded in keeping the faith of Jesus Christ alive among us in all its integrity and purity. There is our crime." That some among them had fallen into apostasy they bitterly lament, but the rest were not to blame. They concluded by beseeching his Holiness, if not to preside at their council, at least to grant his benediction. So moving and earnest an epistle deserved acknowledgment at least, but none was granted.

Among the bases of pacification which the council proposed, was the election of bishops by the clergy and people, with confirmation by the metropolitan. And for settlement of the competing claims between constitutional priests and bishops and others of the old *régime*, it was proposed that where one of each class existed in the same bishopric or parish, the one of

oldest consecration should hold the see and the other succeed him. Le Coz, President of the National Council, wrote to the pre-revolution Bishop of Angers, imploring him to answer whether he would cast in his lot with those who were striving for the restoration of the faith. The other replied promptly and with politeness, that he hoped by the grace of Jesus Christ to be faithful to the duties laid on him at his consecration, as well as to the oath which he had made to obey the laws of the Republic. But he returned no answer to the real question addressed to him, and the Constitutional Church, perfect in all respects except in the absence of institution from Rome, was left to fight the battle of the faith unhelped.

The government, in spite of its pretended toleration, was openly bent upon destroying the Christian religion. It was at this time that the notable attempt was made, with every possible assistance from the government, to establish the "*Jour de Decadi*" as a substitute for the Christian Sunday. Bishop Gregoire gives an amusing account of this enterprise. "The deputy Romme hoped to make an end of Sunday. Upon this occasion I told him, It existed before you, and it will exist after you. The motion of Romme was welcomed by the government, but there was embarrassment in the choice of means. They did not dare to have recourse to persecution. But there was already a little army fighting under the banner of Decadi; the Theophilanthropists. Decadary fêtes were ordered throughout France, writers were paid to organise them, journalists to write them up, orators

to speak at them, and poets to prepare songs for them. Money was lavished. The churches were encumbered with all kinds of scaffolding which could prevent or incommode Christian solemnities. Municipal functionaries, some excited, and some ashamed of their part, attended the decadary parodies, where were displayed busts of the author of *La Pucelle* and that of the *Nouvelle Heloise*, who got rid of his children by sending them to institutions. Such a spectacle, it is plain, was calculated to have a good effect upon morals. For the rest nothing was wanting—except a congregation."

Theophilanthropy was one of those attempts to supply a positive substitute of Christianity, without which the negative efforts of infidelity are so useless. It had a Manual, a Ritual, and a Calendar. It was founded on the idea that all religions resemble one another in certain points, the chief of which is "Theophilanthropy." It was the precursor of the religion of Auguste Comte. And in the actual situation of France, and the general disturbance of minds, these enthusiasts had a better chance than ever after of planting their system in some vacant place where the Church had left the ground free. But amidst all the torments and troubles of men's spirits, few found a refuge in Theophilanthropy. Its white robe with rose-coloured girdle, its flowers and fruit, its eloquent orations, which, by permission of the government, were sometimes held in Notre Dame, and the favour of some really able men obtained for it but five years of languishing existence; then the consuls deprived it of the leave to use the churches, and it never built any of its own.

Pope Pius VI., who with the best intentions had committed himself fatally to the old *régime*, both in France and Italy, died at Valence a prisoner under the Directors and their triumphant general, Napoleon Bonaparte. Pius VII. entered on his pontificate in the year 1800, just when Napoleon placed himself at the head of affairs with the title of First Consul.

This was but a stepping-stone. He aimed at the rank of emperor and the rôle of Charlemagne. After all the tempests which had passed over religion in France, it hardly required the penetration of a Napoleon to know that Catholicism alone could help him in his design. He had himself no religion except faith in his star. But he had, on the other hand, no scruples to hinder him from encouraging the extremest ultramontanism as an instrument. Immediately after the battle of Marengo, he announced to the Court of Rome his desire to treat with the Pope for the restoration of religion in France, and his advances were received with great cordiality and hope. In such a movement it was inevitable that the constitutional clergy should be overwhelmed. Between a Pope eager to re-establish his authority and a potentate desirous of an engine of despotism, what could be hoped for a body which desired free elections of bishops and a free church? Nevertheless, Napoleon had no desire to see the Constitutionals crushed. He permitted them to hold their second council while the negotiations for the Concordat were proceeding. He held conferences with many of their body, especially Gregoire. He made it a point that no retractation should be demanded from the

considerable number of them whom he nominated to the new episcopate.

The constitutional bishops made a voluntary and simultaneous resignation of their sees for the sake of peace, saving the liberties of the Gallican Church. But the prelates of the ancient *régime*, who refused to resign, were deprived. The Pope, however, begged to be allowed not to make public this treatment of aged prelates who had suffered cruel persecution for the Church; the more so because he himself admitted that his right to deprive them was doubtful. Napoleon, as his manner was, negotiated as master of the situation, and the Pope was forced to submit. The nomination of prelates was left to the first consul and his successors, always provided that they should not be Protestants. The instance of Napoleon himself proved that there was no similar objection to their being unbelievers.

M. About in 1860 exhorted Napoleon III. to read the history of the founder of his dynasty. He would see that his uncle, having been consecrated by the Reaction in the person of the Pope, was betrayed by France, Europe, and the Pope himself. Such a calamity, M. About thinks, would not have happened had he been consecrated by the Revolution.[1] But Napoleon was very well aware of the value of the consecrations of the Revolution. They had not tended to secure the heads on which they had been poured. And the advantages to be procured from the religious alliance were argued out by the great man himself with the

[1] *Question Romaine*, Preface.

coolest cynicism. "For my part I do not see in it the mystery of the Incarnation, but the mystery of social order. Society cannot exist without inequality of fortune, nor inequality of fortune without religion. Where a man is dying of hunger beside another who is gorging himself, it is impossible for him to approve the difference unless there is some authority to assure him that it is the will of God."[1]

Napoleon thought it a great pity that he could not manage the whole affair himself "like Henry VIII. of England. The head of the French Government would then become by statute the head of the French Church. Unfortunately France has a repugnance to this."[2] But the constitutional headship of the English kings, who could only go as far as the nation and national Church went with them, would not have satisfied Napoleon. His conception was to use the Church as a spiritual army under his own command. In this view he established in the Church a discipline as arbitrary as that of soldiers. The clergy were under the absolute command of their bishops, and the bishops under that of the Pope. The system, though extravagantly Gallican as regards the authority of the civil power over the ecclesiastical, was extravagantly ultramontane as to the power of the superior clergy over the inferior. At the outset it required an unexampled exercise of Papal tyranny in the deprivation of the ancient bishops of France; and although the authority which the Concordat recognised in the civil power is still active in France, yet the most important influence which the settlement

[1] Taine in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 1891, p. 8. [2] Ibid.

exercised on the Church has been its military subjection to the Pope and the bishops; this has remained, while the Empire, for the sake of which it was imposed, has passed away.

The disciplinary regulations of the Concordat of 1801 are chiefly contained in the Organic Articles which Napoleon incorporated with that document in execution of the powers assigned by it to the temporal ruler; but the Organic Articles had never been seen, much less assented to, by the Pope. He remonstrated against them from the first. Pius VII. conceived that he was about to obtain a modification of them as the price of his complaisance in repairing to Paris to crown the Emperor; but no such boon was ceded. The Pope was fascinated by Napoleon, and conceived an affection for him which even the cruel persecutions which followed did not impair; but the Emperor held a conception of his own supreme power which could not be reconciled with the spiritual independence of any authority, much less with the claims of the Papacy. The Pope obtained little by his journey to France beyond the re-establishment of some religious congregations, and an increase of emolument for *desservants* or stipendiary curates;[1] but all religious orders were regarded by the Emperor as regiments in the spiritual army, and subservient to his secular purposes, whether engaged in works of charity at home or in missions abroad.[2] No honour, advantage, or opportunity was conceded to the Church unless it appeared capable of assisting the work of

[1] Jervis, The Gallican Church and the Revolution, p. 414.
[2] Taine, *loc. cit.*, p. 22.

spiritual police, for which alone the Emperor allowed her to stand.

Even the very act of consecration which the Pope came so far to perform was the means not merely of uplifting the temporal power another step above the spiritual, but of endowing it with a quasi-spiritual character of its own. "Vivat in æternum semper Augustus," said the Pope, repeating the words addressed to Charlemagne a thousand years before. Napoleon's interpretation of their meaning was given when he seized Ancona, in the Papal States, to protect it against the English fleets. He explained that he had done so in his character of Protector of the Holy See. "I considered myself, after the example of my predecessors of the second and third race, as the eldest son of the Church, bearing the sword for the express purpose of protecting it, and shielding it from profanation at the hands of heretics and Mussulmans. In regard to the Pope, I hold the place of Charlemagne because, like Charlemagne, I have annexed the crown of France to that of the Lombards. I will make no change in my policy if he behaves himself well, but otherwise I will reduce the Pope to be Bishop of Rome." "Your Holiness is sovereign of Rome, but I am its Emperor. All my enemies ought to be yours. I shall always preserve for your Holiness, as the head of our religion, that filial attachment which I have shown under all circumstances; but I am responsible to God, who has been pleased to make use of my arm for the restoration of religion, and how can I, without grief,

behold it compromised by the delays of the court of Rome?"[1]

We see here the same argument from the development of facts in the history of Europe, which has been of so much use to the Papacy. To Napoleon the wonderful progress of his victories seemed as striking a revelation of Providence as the growth of Papal power. The one indeed was but a matter of ten years, the other of fifteen hundred, but the argument is similar in kind. The Pope never conceded the justice of these inflated claims. Perhaps if he had consented to regard the English as his enemies, because they were the Emperor's, he would not have been doing much more than his predecessors of the Reformation period in their alliances with Spain; but he denied the existence of any Emperor of Rome, and this was the cause of the final rupture between Pope and Emperor, which had, on the one hand, a part in Napoleon's downfall, and, on the other, led to the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope during the rest of the imperial reign, and was a precedent for that apparently final extinction of it which our days have witnessed.

In the year 1806 the principles of the Concordat were embodied, for the instruction of the boys and girls of France, in a catechism issued by the command of the Emperor. It was founded upon the catechism of Bossuet, altered to suit the times; and Napoleon, who displayed in the department of law his miraculous power of rapid grasp of a new science, showed in this instance a similar capacity in theology. The catechist

[1] Jervis, p. 418.

is instructed to ask, "What is to be thought of those who fail in their duty to the Emperor?" and the answer is, "According to S. Paul they would be resisting the ordinance of God Himself, and would render themselves worthy of eternal damnation." Certain bishops objected that S. Paul cannot be understood as denouncing everlasting punishment for civil disobedience;[1] but nothing less than the extreme penalty would satisfy the Emperor. His spiritual police must not be deprived of their weapons. On the other hand, he consented, in pursuance of the remonstrances of churchmen, to restore to the Catechism the dogma that "beyond the Church there is no salvation." By these mutual concessions on both sides, the French *gamin* was apprised of the complete extent of the danger of disobedience either to the priest or the *gendarme*. It would not appear that he has attended to either warning.

When the Pope was carried as a prisoner from Rome, imprisoned in Savona, and separated from his secretaries and advisers, the single weapon which he still had power to use was the refusal to institute bishops of the Emperor's choice—a renewal of the tactics of the Papacy against Louis XIV. His claim in this respect did not date from ancient times; institution was given of old by the metropolitan. But the power of institution had been conceded to the Pope by the Concordat, and the attempt to withdraw it was part of the same plan of spiritual tyranny which the successor of Charlemagne was everywhere enforcing. The Pope resisted with obstinacy, and, instead of

[1] Jervis, p. 428.

usurping, seemed to be defending the liberties of the Church. At Savona, indeed, under the pressure of disease and the importunity of a deputation of French divines, and afterwards at Fontainebleau, under the irresistible force of Napoleon's personal influence, the old man yielded for a time; but he recalled his assent with remorse, and ruin overtook the Emperor, not yet master of the Church.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE CHURCH OF FRANCE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

State of the Church at the Restoration—Unsuccessful attempt to amend the Concordat—Unpopularity of the Church—Revolution of 1830—Progress of Ultramontanism—Jos. de Maistre—La Mennais—The modern Church of France—The Immaculate Conception—Infallibility—Condition and prospects of the Church.

THE Restoration found the Church of France in a miserable condition. The long catalogue of dioceses without bishops, of cardinals, prelates, and priests in prison, of congregations suppressed, of abject time-servers promoted, enriched, ennobled, and decorated, was sufficiently degrading; but more important than any is the fact that while the Organic Articles had deprived the bishops of authority to ordain without the leave of the State, the State, unwilling to see its conscripts turned into priests, permitted, during the Emperor's reign of fifteen years, only six or seven priests to be made annually for each diocese of France. We must remember the vast size of the new dioceses, and we must add that it was a rule (in order to save stipends) that curés should be chosen from among those clergy who were pensioned by the Constituent Assembly; that is to say, from among the old and lukewarm. We see at once that the devastations of the Revolution, and of the long period of religious

decay which preceded it, must have remained wholly unrepaired at the Restoration.

The dignified clergy of France had no great reason for pride in the part borne by their order during the struggle between the Emperor and the Pope. There were noble exceptions, such as the Abbé Emery, who checked the Emperor in his excess of passion by referring him to the principles recognised in his own catechism, and the Abbé d'Astros, who spoiled the attempt of Cardinal Maury to administer the diocese of Paris without canonical institution, in the character of Capitular Vicar; but these were exceptions. The committees and councils which Napoleon summoned during the period of struggle gave little help to their Pontiff in his straits; and if they passed any spirited resolution when united, they recalled it when the emperor's minister had conferred with them individually. "Take them one by one," said Cardinal Maury; "the wine is excellent, but it will be better in bottles than in the wood."[1] Thus, while the Church of the Restoration was well prepared to accept and enjoy any return of ancient privileges which might come to it from the renewed royalty, it was less capable of the task, as yet unperformed, of restoring the old faith. It became weaker in the nation with every year, and association with the Bourbon reaction hindered rather than helped it.

The difficulties which had arisen under the Concordat of 1801 were so numerous, that it seemed absolutely needful to alter it. Indeed, some of the pre-Revolution

[1] Jervis, p. 478.

bishops repudiated it altogether. A new convention was therefore signed by the French Ambassador at Rome, on the part of France, and by Cardinal Consalvi as Secretary of State to the Pope, by which the Concordat of 1801 was set aside, and that of 1516 re-established, the Organic Articles abrogated so far as they contradicted the laws of the Church, and a large number of suppressed sees restored. But Louis XVIII. had not the arbitrary power either of a Francis I. or of a Napoleon. The project had to be submitted to the Legislature, where it met with a bad reception, and it was totally overthrown by a response from the Pope himself, explaining that the decisions of the Holy See upon matters of religion could not be afterwards submitted to a lay assembly. The Church was left in a condition of uncertainty, fluctuating between the Concordats[1] until 1822, when thirty new sees were added to the prelature of France, thus raising the number to eighty; for the rest, the arrangements of the Concordats were left to work as they might. This was effected by a Papal bull, published in France by a royal ordinance, with the most ample reservations of all civil rights and Gallican privileges. It became plain that a general arrangement between Church and State had been rendered possible only by Napoleon's autocracy, and the peculiar urgency of the state of religion after the Revolution. The combination is never likely to occur again. The difficulty of carrying measures of Church reform through the English Parliament is but a faint shadow of that of forcing an omnipotent people

[1] Jervis, p. 499.

and an omnipotent Pope to compromise their claims. The relations of the Church of France to the government remain as the Concordat of Napoleon I. determined, and it is impossible to foresee any essential change.

During the two reigns of the restored Bourbons, the Church of France shared the illusions of the Court, and carried to an excess the principles of Divine right. There was nothing in her history corresponding to the story of the seven English bishops whose spirited action separated the fortunes of their Church from that of the Stuart dynasty, and raised her to an unexampled place in popular favour, at the very time when the monarchy to which she had been so deeply attached went to the ground. On the contrary, the solidarity between the French Church and the ancient *régime* was so firmly established in the opinion of the nation, that after the Revolution of 1830, a priest in France dared not show himself in the streets in his soutane.

Such extreme devotion to the monarchy was apparently more Gallican than ultramontane. "It is proper to add," says M. de Montalembert, "for the instruction of those who have not sounded the abysses of French variability, that at this period (1831), ultramontane doctrines encountered among the immense majority of the clergy precisely the same unpopularity as that of which Gallicanism is now (1862) the victim."[1] At the same time, the likeness between a secular monarchy invested with many sacred attributes, and a Papacy

[1] *Vie de Lacordaire*, p. 50.

invested with much secular power, is so great, that allegiance is easily transferred from one to the other. The Jesuits, though sworn devotees of the Pope, were thought, in the seventeenth century, to be more devoted to the king of France.[1] In the nineteenth, on the other hand, the events of the Empire had placed the Pontiff in so attractive a light before the clergy of France, as to set him beside the ancient monarchy while it existed, and leave him heir to their whole devotion as soon as the ancient monarchy vanished. He it was whom the clear-visioned First Consul had recognised as the sole head of the Church, fit to make a treaty for her, as the commander-in-chief of an army might do for it; he it was whose right of institution represented the only possible form of Church liberty, when the ancient systems of popular election or of metropolitan institution would have merely meant imperial prescription; he it was who had endured for the Church such pains of body and mind as entitled early Christians to be called confessors; lastly, it was to him that the clergy of France owed the poor pittance which the Concordat afforded them, and such small increase of it as could be wrung from the imperial treasury.

The few literary works of religion which made a stir in those times of revolution and of war tended likewise to ultramontanism. The *Génie de Christianisme* of Chateaubriand was a work of genius; but that which most strongly influenced or best presaged the spirit of the Church of France when her revival should come, was probably the treatise *Du Pape* of Joseph

[1] See Dollinger's "Studies in European History," p. 278.

de Maistre, published in 1819.[1] Its literary merits are of a high character, and thoroughly French. It is admirably well marshalled, and assumes throughout an air of practical good sense, as if supporting facts against theory. Nothing can be more witty than its illustrations; as when Bossuet's assertion of the indefectibility of the Papacy as distinguished from the infallibility of particular Popes, is refuted by the example of the realism of the Middle Ages. "These realists who assigned existence to universals, had at least the extreme kindness not to take it away from individuals. While maintaining the reality of the abstract elephant, they never asked him to furnish us with ivory; we had always the privilege of demanding that from the tangible elephants whom we had at hand." What can be neater than the proof adapted to the mind of statesmen that Papal infallibility is just what they require. "That believers dispute about infallibility I know, because I see it, but that the politician should do so, I could never understand. If he believes himself in the region of mere opinion, will he not try to fix it? To spare the two things most precious in the world, namely, time and money, make haste to write to Rome and procure a legal decision which shall pronounce the doubt illegal; that is all you want. Politics require no more."[2]

It would be unfair to confound this reasoning, addressed to unbelieving statesmen, with that which

[1] Mgr. Maret, however, attributes a larger ultramontane influence to La Mennais. *Du Concile General*, ii. 343.

[2] *Du Pape*, liv. i. chs. 11, 17.

De Maistre uses with the persons whom he calls "systematic Catholics." Still there is a certain common character among all the arguments. He declares that in ascribing infallibility to the Church he attributes to her no more than must be claimed by any sovereign power, which must needs act as absolute and infallible, and ceases to exist when it allows anybody to resist it on the ground that it can be mistaken. This is the theory which would be likely to approve itself to a statesman of the time of the Congress of Vienna. But the sacredness of truth is degraded by the comparison. The existence of the kingdom of Christ does not resemble the fictions of temporal authority. De Maistre does not so much as mention the personal reign of Christ Himself. M. Taine observes that the theory of imperial Rome, by which the external religion of her people belonged to her alone to determine, was entertained both by the lawyers of the monarchy and by Napoleon. De Maistre's book is plain evidence that the same theory can be well transferred to Papal Rome, which furnishes a second Cæsar for the affairs of religion, to whom homage is to be paid quite parallel to that due to the temporal Cæsar in his department.

The theory of development can scarcely be stated in a more extreme form than that in which De Maistre traces the gradual rise of Papal power. "No important institution ever originated in a law. It forms itself by the concurrence of a thousand, who generally know not what they are doing. Had S. Peter a distinct knowledge of the extent of his prerogative, and of the questions to which it would give rise in the future? I

know not." But De Maistre here confounds the growth of natural powers into recognition with the proof of an authority derived from divine commission. Those who depend upon natural powers may leave their acceptance to come about by their own merit. But those who act under a commission must show it. S. Paul claimed and defended his apostleship; and if S. Peter did not know of his commission he cannot have received it. An infallibility constructed and manufactured by the course of European history may find favour with minds to which system and organisation are everything, but they will never be accepted by those races to whom truth is a mental and a personal possession. If any one desires to know what absolute incapacity for understanding any religion except one of submission to autocracy a champion of ultramontanism can display, he should read De Maistre's treatise on the Gallican Church.[1] There he will find Protestantism, Jansenism, Gallicanism, and Port Royal treated with equal hatred and contempt, and Louis XIV. and his great divines found guilty of every crime against religion, except their real sin of persecution.

Another epoch-making work of the Restoration period was the *Essai sur l'Indifference* of La Mennais. It is a splendid assertion of the principle of authority against all the philosophies, and all the compromises, scientific and worldly, of the day. Protestantism of every degree must fall into line with the rest, and be classed as a form of indifference. As if there was not an indiffer-

[1] See this treatise examined with great and just severity in Mgr. Maret's work, *Du Concile General*, vol. ii. pp. 324 *et seq.*

ence which shows itself by submission to authority, and an intense earnestness which acts by resistance; as if Luther at Worms represented scepticism and Leo X. faith. La Mennais' book was a trumpet blast to gather the loyal children of the Church, but to repel the rest of the nation. With what contempt would revolutionary France—as she was then, and is to this very day—read the following picture of the *ancien régime:* "There existed thirty years ago a nation governed by an ancient race of kings under a constitution the most perfect that ever existed, and under laws which might have been believed, more justly than those of the ancient Romans, to have come down from heaven, so wise were they, so pure, so benevolent, so humane. This nation, celebrated for its frankness, gentleness, and enlightenment, for its loyalty to its kings and to the religion to which it owed fourteen centuries of glory and happiness, flourished in peace in the midst of Europe, which envied it, and of which it was the ornament by the beauty of its legislation, by the noble politeness of its manners, and its high achievements in letters, science, and the arts."

La Mennais changed his opinion of the *ancien régime.* We find him, after the Revolution of 1830, the centre of a group of noble-minded men who could not bear to see their ancient Church tied to the corpse of the monarchy. The story of Montalembert, Lacordaire, and La Mennais, their revered leader, has been told in English.[1] Their journal, *l'Avenir*, was designed to promote the combination of liberty and

[1] See Mrs. Oliphant's "Life of Montalembert."

ultramontanism, and claim for the Church the freedom in education of which the State deprived her. But so little attraction did the advocates of liberty feel for the Church, or those of the Church for liberty, that the journal, though written by men of genius, never circulated three thousand copies. And the celebrated pilgrimage to Rome, when the three enthusiasts proceeded to lay their case before the supreme tribunal, to which they had pinned their faith, might well seem the attempt to impart a heroic ending to an enterprise which was in any case obliged to wind up its concerns.

They waited, as many have waited, for a response at the Pope's threshold; and when after long delay the response was given, it was a condemnation. "From the infected source of indifferentism," said the Pope, "flows this absurd and erroneous maxim, or rather this madness, that liberty of conscience should be guaranteed and assured to every one, whoever he be." The author of the essay on "Indifference" could not accept this version of his theory.[1] Lacordaire and Montalembert submitted. They were noble-minded and devoted men; but what they meant by their submission, or by what process they persuaded themselves to make it, are points which an Englishman cannot understand. His own Church makes no such demands upon him. The very reason why we admire so intensely the religious character of these two saintly men is that to the end of their lives they were faithful

[1] An interesting study of La Mennais is in S. Beuve's *Portraits Contemporaine*, vol. i., and another in Professor Dowden's "Studies in Literature," p 311.

to those principles of liberty to the condemnation of which by the Pope they now adhered.[1]

The same phenomenon occurs again and again in the modern Church of France. The theologians who proved the dogma of Papal infallibility to be irreconcilable with history, submitted to it when decreed. The Curé d'Ars was a veritable saint. His biography renews for us in the nineteenth century the simple and absolute self-sacrifice which we find in the *Acta Sanctorum*. But we would not have any one whose faith was unfixed read the chapter of that biography which tells of the good curé's conduct in respect to the miraculous appearance of the Blessed Virgin at La Salette, lest he should suppose that this was the way in which the early miracles of Christianity came to be believed. The urchin Maximin, to whom this revelation had been made, admitted to the curé that he had seen nothing. But the devotion spread, pilgrimages began, and the sanction of a bishop was given. The saintly man suffered years of anguish from his inability to credit, at the bidding of the Church, that which he knew not to be the fact; until

[1] Ils se croient fermement dociles au saint-siége mais ce qu'ils ont de meilleur proteste et resiste. Comment en serait-il autrement? Comment une abjuration serait-elle autre chose qu'une vaine forme? La pensée dans l'homme n'obeit a aucun consigne, pas même a celle qu'il voudrait se donner a lui même, pas plus à un scrupule qu'à un calul, elle laisse passer le crise; puis elle se redresse invincible.—De Presseusé, *Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 49.

The biographer of Monseigneur Dupanloup pronounces that prelate's conduct in retiring from the Vatican Council without giving his vote against the decree of Infallibility to be a *felix culpa*—if a fault.—*Vie de Monseigneur Dupanloup*, par l'Abbé Lagrange, 6me edit. vol. iii. p. 162.

at last the miraculous removal of a pain, upon his determining to say "Credo," gave him the sanction he required for assenting to the edifying fable. And he was happy.[1]

Such passages suggest the fear that Popes and bishops will never again hear from French priests the utterance of primitive faith, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."

But the extravagant importance attached to submission cannot in ordinary times bar the access of earnest spirits to the highest sources of spiritual life. Among all the treasures of Christian biography there are none more precious than the life of Henri Perreyve, the Journal of Eugenie de Guerin, the life and letters of Frederic Ozanam. All of them, tried by long sickness and a premature death, left behind valuable proofs of literary ability. Those of Ozanam are among the most learned productions of the historical school of France. He was, besides, a devoted worker and organiser of work for the poor; the precursor therein of many writers and labourers in social affairs, at whose head the present Pope has placed himself by his encyclical upon the relations of employers and their workmen. All who have had the opportunity of witnessing the private life of religious families in France bear witness to its exquisite charm and grace, its simplicity, and the unity of the highest with the

[1] *Vie de M. J. B. M. Vianney, Curé d'Ars*, par Mounin, chap. x.; *Vie Nouvelle du Curé d'Ars*, chap. xliv. See an account of the evidence in Neale's "Present State of the Gallican Church: Essays," 1867, p. 332.

lowest. But the tendency of the French mind towards over-organisation, both in thought and life, and its repulsion from whatever is individual or speculative, has concurred with the sad events of French history, and the ambition of Rome, to cut off the Church from the national life and drill it into a garrison living in a country hostile to its claims, and therefore needing the stricter separation.

One by one the classes who place any limits to their ecclesiastical allegiance have been cast out and turned into enemies. First the Protestants, then the Jansenists, then the Constitutionalists, then the Gallicans; and unhappily each purging of the ranks has been accompanied with such violence as has made reconciliation impossible, and grieves the heart of true Catholics to this day; for a true Catholic must regard all baptized Christians as belonging to his Church. The errors of separatists are for him errors within the Church itself as certainly as rebellion among the inhabitants of a country is rebellion against its government. It will not be for him, whatever others may do, to exult in the discipline of the few who remain while he remembers the loss of the many who are gone.

The king of France, while there was a king, was the eldest son of the Church. And the Church of France remains still that part of the Roman communion which possesses the largest importance for the general body. It is quite certain that the position and even the doctrines of Rome would not be what they are if it were not for the course of French history during the last

century. The power of the French king, with his Gallican liberties and traditional rights at his back, was the closest approach to a counterbalance of the Papacy which ever existed. And when this was removed, and Rome could add the splendid squadrons of the Church of France to the hosts of whom she already disposed, she was strong indeed. In 1854 the Pope proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It was declared upon his own sole authority without a council; the consultation of bishops which preceded it was ostentatiously proclaimed to be without authority in the definition. Its reception in France indicated the combined influence of popular Mariolatry and obedience to authority; and also the decay of the regard for truth. Who could believe, upon any grounds of proof known to man, that a theory uncertain for eighteen hundred years had all at once become a certainty, or that any peculiar power of ascertaining it was open to Pius IX. above all who had preceded him? It resembled, in the more awful sphere of Christian truth and falsehood, those unconstitutional acts of tyrannical sovereigns which the best part of the nation are forced to accept because they are popular with the multitude. The Curé d'Ars, before the new dogma was a defined article of faith, had "attached his heart to this secret belief," and when the voice of the supreme chief of Holy Church had made itself heard, he cried, "What happiness! I always thought that this ray of splendour was wanting to the Catholic truth."[1]

[1] *Vie du Curé d'Ars*, ii. 431.

One voice of protest was heard. The Abbé Laborde of Lectour, an old priest and scholar universally respected, took his pilgrimage to Rome, as La Mennais had done twenty years before, bringing with him a work in which he had stated the principles so familiar to us, and so well recognised in primitive times;[1] that no new dogma can be also true; that among all mankind One only was exempt from original sin; that those united with the chair of Peter have yet but one chief, Christ Jesus, and that Popes have been repeatedly anathematised for errors by councils and by saints; further, that the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was unknown so late as S. Anselm, that Johannes Scotus was the first who taught it openly,[2] and that it began to take form only in the time of S. Bernard. But the truth-seeker, instead of finding a welcome at the supposed seat of truth, was persecuted by the pontifical police, and forcibly re-embarked for France, where he returned to die in a hospital, making with his failing hand a last protest against the new error. He was a saint more after the taste of Englishmen than was the Curé d'Ars.[3]

When the episcopate of France suffered this inroad upon the Catholic constitution, they gave away all chance of contesting Papal Infallibility. When the time for proclaiming that dogma had arrived, in the

[1] *Lettre a U. S. P. La Pape Pius IX. sur l'Impossibilite du Nouveau Dogme* (Paris, 1854).

[2] Laborde, *La Croyance de l'Immaculée Conception ne peut devenir Dogme de Foi* (3rd ed., Paris, 1854), pp. 9, 20, 51, 57, 86.

[3] See the story of the Abbé Laborde's testimony and death, with the protests of the few who followed his example, in Neale, *loc. cit.* 338 *et seq.*

opinion of the "insolent and aggressive faction" who longed for it, full advantage was taken of the presumption of its truth involved in the Pope's addition of a new article to the faith in 1854. Monseigneur Maret, it is true, in his exhaustive work upon the Vatican Council,[1] contrasts the two dogmas. The earlier of them seemed to him "dear to piety, but above all speculative; a homage rendered to the Mother of God, it rejoiced all Catholic hearts, and was only the regular development of previous belief;" but it made no such palpable and visible change in the sovereignty of the Church as that which the decree of infallibility involved.[2] The reasoning is hard to follow unless it involves the doubt whether the Immaculate Conception be a genuine fact at all. And Monseigneur Maret does not notice the nature of the authority upon which the proclamation of 1854 was made. If King Charles I. had succeeded in taxing by his own authority, he would not have more surely proved his independence of Parliament than the Pope dissipated Maret's theory of a spiritual monarchy tempered by the concurrent rights of the episcopate, when he claimed to reveal, without the concurrence of any other bishop, a fact nineteen hundred years old, which could be known only to God.

But Monseigneur Maret's work, though too late, was entirely solid and decisive upon the novelty of the

[1] *Du Concile General*, par Monseigneur H. C. L. Maret, 2 vols. (Paris, 1869).

[2] Maret, vol. ii. p. 378.

doctrine of Papal infallibility. "There," said he, "is the history of the Church. These are facts beyond all serious controversy. The result is that the Church has been up to the present, conformably to its divine institution, a monarchy effectually conditioned by aristocracy, a monarchy essentially deliberative. But if the definition which a school more ardent than wise demands were possible, if it were carried, it will naturally result that the Church will become, in law as in fact, a monarchy pure, indivisible, and absolute."[1]

De Maistre foresaw, much better than Monseigneur Maret, the conditions and checks of the Papacy of the future when he asked and answered the question, "What then will stop the Pope? Everything; the canons, the laws, the customs of the nations, the sovereignties, the great tribunals, national assemblies, prescriptions, representations, negotiations, duty, fear, prudence, and above all, opinion, the queen of the world."[2] But the exchange of constitutional checks for vague and uncovenanted influences has been often made by peoples who desired strong centralised rule in the state. It has not answered. Either the hopes of strong government or the anticipated restraints have proved illusory, or both have failed together.

The technical exercise of Papal infallibility is limited by conditions so difficult to define as to render it of little or no practical use. A decision may be supposed

[1] Maret, vol. ii. p. 377.

[2] Quoted by Maret, ii. 323. The interesting work of Mr. Wilfrid Ward, entitled "William George Ward and the Catholic Revival," contains much information on the Church of France before the Vatican Council. See especially Chap. V.

for centuries to have issued from infallibility, and may have been the cause of moral torment and of persecutions like that of Galileo. When opinion, the queen of the world, pronounces it wrong, it will be satisfactorily proved that it had not the conditions of infallibility at all. But the sovereign who is infallible under certain extraordinary conditions, must needs be nearly so under all conditions; it is in this ordinary but very deceptive sphere that the exaltation of the Pope has its most important effect, and he has used it not in checking, but in favouring and stamping the tendencies of popular opinion.

The modern practices of religion in France are so full of directions, regulations, and beliefs unknown to primitive Christianity, that if we could suppose the devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and S. Joseph, and the Sacred Heart, with their rosaries, pilgrimages, and special seasons to be universally observed, we should conclude that the whole method and system of the Church's prayer had changed, and that the branch of the Church Catholic which makes the highest boast of unchangeableness had come to depend on novelty for sustaining the interest of its adherents.[1] We may be sure that this could not be the case, and, in fact, we find that the best minds in the Church of France itself lament that "trifling devotions have too often taken the place of noble sentiments and great virtues; petty practices have been substituted for manly actions.

[1] See an interesting account of the devotional variety, combined with Catholic usage, which obtained even in the case of a particular parish before the Revolution, in an article upon a prayer-book of the parish of S. Etienne du Mont.—*The Guardian*, July 12, 1893.

The true type of perfection to be attained has been falsified, changed, degraded." [1]

This is the retrograde line which development takes in the churches of the Roman obedience, under the modern facilities for stamping novelties with a sanction supposed to be divine. Any thoughtful reader of the New Testament may see what is the course of development upon which Christianity was started in its beginning. It originates in the Incarnation, and the divine germ thus sown springs from the soil in the words and works of Jesus, ever growing in importance

[1] M. Lasserre, quoted in "Some Features of Modern Romanism" (S.P.C.K.), p. 13. I quote some sentences of a letter received from the author of this most instructive work, who has been for thirty years chaplain to an English congregation in France. "The patronage of all ecclesiastical matters is getting more and more highly centralised, and the influence of the Papal curia is felt in every diocese. There has been lately a recrudescence of what we must term bigotry. The attitude of the younger clergy towards men outside the Roman Catholic Church is distinctly less liberal than that of the older generation, and markedly so towards English congregations and clergy. I do not find any successors to the clergy and even sisters with whom I was on quite friendly terms some years ago, and who gladly accepted help and talked about the best ways of distributing it. On one point there has been an opposite action in the English Church and the Church of Rome in France—the observance of the Sunday. Beginning in the time of the Empire, there is a growing feeling for its more stringent observance to the extent of even advocating the stopping of the post and lessening railway trains, but at present the feeling seems to be confined to clerical circles. So, too, there is a movement headed by the Abbé Garnier for the study of the whole Gospels and of the New Testament in schools and by the laity. Friends who are acquainted with students in Paris tell me that the rising generation is distinctly more religious than its predecessor. Certainly the semi-persecution by Republicans has done the Church no real harm, rather the contrary. . . . There is the odd feature that many who act politically against the Church often send their daughters to be educated in the strictest convents. The clerical party maintain that what the Church in France has lost in breadth it has gained in intensity."

to mankind as the end of His life approaches, until we come to the Gospel of the Cross; then the Spirit working in the Apostolic Church enlarges the scope of the message, and takes into the fold one race after another, each with its contribution of thoughts and habits, and the old questions of science and metaphysics assume their Christian form in the writings of S. Paul. This is the noble and solid evolution which was begun in the Bible and set forward in the course of Catholic tradition. But in the great Church of France development is now wholly ignorant of the New Testament. It has dismissed S. Paul with Port Royal, and takes a different direction. Instead of following on from the Incarnation through the life of Christ towards His death, and the expansions which follow, it looks backward to the surroundings of His cradle, which Scripture leaves wholly behind. Even in the great work of Père Didon the later events of the life of Christ, so prominent in the Gospels, fill a most inadequate space.[1] But this blot in a grand book is but an indication of the backward set of the current. We find the full vigour of the tendency in the place which the Blessed Virgin holds to devotion, in her elevation to superhuman purity of nature, and in the fast-advancing cult of S. Joseph; who, with her and her Divine Son, completes a second Trinity sufficiently human for a Church so identified with an earthly system, and so impatient of mystery.

Even in very grand specimens of modern French religion, sentiment fills a place which Englishmen will never admit. Montalembert claimed to be the child of

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1891.

the Crusaders, while his opponents were children of Voltaire; but there is a higher sonship than either for those whose religion is of the purest type. The conscience, the moral sense, the spiritual faculty are the great common properties of humanity by which the people are to be seized and held. Upon these Port Royal worked. But Jesuitism loosed its hold upon them to comply with the habits of worldly society; the people escaped and have never been recovered. And the very compliances which gained the world of princes and courts were those which lost that democratic world which has taken their place.

It is difficult even for a Frenchman, and much more so for a foreigner, to form an exact idea of the grandeurs, failures, and prospects of the present Church of France. But we find as close an approach to such an estimate as writing can give in three successive articles by M. Taine, published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May and June 1891, combined with an admirable reply by the Abbé de Broglie, as temperate, as well-informed, and very nearly as able as the treatise which called it forth.[1] Both writers agree generally upon the facts of the case.

The eighty or ninety prelates of France are poor men in comparison to the bishops of England, and much more so in comparison to their own predecessors

[1] *Le Present et l'Avenir du Catholicisme en France*, Paris, 1892. See also *Le Clergé et les Temps Nouveaux*, par Elie Marie, Paris, 1892; *Le Clergé sous la Troisième Republique*, par F. Bournaud. But the last is chiefly useful as showing the fanatical side of Church defence. The articles of M. Taine form part of the last volume of the *Origines de la France Contemporaine*, published since the author's lamented death.

of the eighteenth century. But they excel in power and in devotion as much as they fall short in wealth. Before the Revolution the French Church contained 36,000 curés irremovable except by process of law, and 2500 whose title could be revoked by the will of the bishop. The proportion is now almost exactly reversed. The clergy are an army of 40,000 or 50,000 men who march with perfect discipline under the orders of their superiors. Moreover, the legal subjection of the clergy is a far less important matter than the moral discipline which in seminaries, preparatory and advanced, trains and frames in every diocese the youths who possess a vocation into the mould of priestly life. They come almost wholly from a low class in the community: there alone can the requisite alienation from the social life of the world be secured. "Among the 40,000 curés and desservants," says M. Taine, "more than 35,000 belong to the class of working men and peasants." They are men of the purest life, of the most complete devotion. They will go anywhere, and they will do anything; that is to say, anything which lies within the sphere of their training. But large departments of Christian life and work escape them. It is not from them that great theological thinkers, great commentators and critics on the Bible, great reconcilers of new thought with the old, will come. They will not be likely to possess that power of sympathetic attraction which men educated in free sympathy with common human life can wield. As missionaries they sustain their organisations with great perfection, and operate on the natives as on beings of inferior order from

above and apart; but they do not draw them in to be partakers of the work. In this point the English missionaries, though very inferior in numbers and in discipline, seem to be ahead.

But the clergy are only a small part of the disciplined army of the Church of France. There are besides about 30,000 men and 127,000 women, in various orders of the religious life, working with absolute self-sacrifice for the good of their fellow-creatures. When we ask the secret of this vast organisation of charity and devotion, we reject (with the Abbé de Broglie) the solution which M. Taine proposes in the ignorance and sense of mystery which surrounds us in this world. Something more positive is required, and a leader of the work, in reply to a question from the illustrious Agnostic, ascribed it all to the Presence of Jesus in the Holy Eucharist.

What hinders a power so vast and so perfectly organised from carrying everything before it, in a country where it has absolutely no competitors in the supply either of charity or religion? Why is it that in Paris, out of two million inhabitants, only one-twentieth part performs the Easter duties? Of one hundred persons there will be but five communicants, of whom four will be women. In the more favourable circumstances of the country there may be one woman in four a faithful Catholic, and one man out of twelve. The alienation of the ecclesiastical system from the national life is the cause, and M. Taine finds the very core and centre of this separation in the inconsistency of the Roman Catholic theory with science. Transub-

stantiation and Papal infallibility are the patent instances which he selects. The abbé replies that these interpositions of the supernatural are not in opposition to science, which concerns itself only with the appearances of things. We cannot think the reply sufficient; for the words substance and accident concern the constitution of matter, and come with all their meanings within the sphere of science, both mental and physical; while the science of history is closely touched by the supposed presence in the course of the world of a standing institution to which the tests of reason are not to be applied.

When we further ask whether the great structure of the French Church is likely to abide in its present efficiency, the sole reason for doubt is to be found in the war which the Government of France carries on with such unjust virulence against the clergy in the field of education. The supply of candidates with a vocation for the priesthood or the religious life may thus be indefinitely reduced.

English Churchmen may well learn much-needed lessons from the example of French discipline and self-surrender. They may also hope that, by God's blessing, their own Church, and in particular the great Church movement of our day, will keep in closer touch with the nation. They are surrounded by Dissenters, not in the main by unbelievers or the indifferent. A French priest might well wish that the sects had power enough in France to afford a refuge in some form of Christianity for the immense majority of the people. But it is not pure Protestantism that

is awanting. One of the most striking features of French Church history is the inability of Protestantism to affect the mind of the nation at large. The Protestants of the present century have possessed some great and holy names. Their ministers are highly respected, and in many cases do a grand individual work. Adolphe Monod was, in the opinion of Lacordaire, the best preacher of his time. Bersier[1] follows in his train. Coquerel and the Strasburg school represent the Liberals. De Presseusé is known in all the churches. All have produced admirable books of religious thought and Bible study; and sometimes, as in the case of the late Mr. M'All, a splendid work has been effected upon Protestant lines among the masses of working-men whom the Church of France has permitted to escape her. Yet doubtless M. Taine was right in believing that Protestantism cannot, in general, satisfy the French mind.[2] The Protestant burial of that great writer himself did not, unfortunately, indicate the acceptance on his part of Protestant beliefs.

The persecution of the Protestants of France was unrelenting, but, after all, unsuccessful. Though the Protestants of substance were driven out of the country by Louis XIV. and his advisers spiritual and political, yet the peasantry of the Cevennes maintained their faith, and noble-minded men were found to defy the danger of ministering to them, though it was greater

[1] See an excellent view of the history of French Protestantism in M. Bersier's Introduction to his *Histoire du Synode Generale de l'Eglise Reformée de France.* 10 Juillet 1872.

[2] *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 1 Juin 1891, p. 500.

than the soldier has to face in battle. The Church in the Desert is the grandest period of French Protestantism. It was not extinguished, and the infidels of the Revolution gave it that toleration to which the Church of France never consented.

One would have supposed that the glorious opposition of Protestantism to the tyranny of King and Pope would have fitted it to advance and conquer, when both these powers crashed down, and France was left panting for a religion. Nothing of the kind took place. The influence of Protestantism and Protestants in the Revolution was little or none—a sharp contrast to corresponding movements in England. Whatever religion France thought of turning to, it never thought of Protestantism. And when Napoleon determined to use religion as an instrument of government, and constituted the Reformed minister with the Jewish Rabbi and the Roman priest into paid State functionaries, none accepted the servitude and the stipend with more docility than the Minister; whom Joseph de Maistre describes as "an honest-spoken personage in black." And whatever revival there has been in French Protestantism—as much there has been—is spoiled for purposes of national influence by its dissensions.

The French nation, with all that variability and licence which the world knows too well, combines an undoubted love of organisation and form. Its impulses towards liberty and towards order alike exaggerate our own. By a sad perversity, French Protestantism offers its religious liberty without any form or order. French Catholicism clung so long to the

old *régime* that liberty in all its struggles found the Church opposed. It is, perhaps, now too late for her to persuade the nation that she has shaken herself free from monarchical traditions. But could she do so, the nation must still know that she only retreats upon the Papacy, a *régime* more ancient, more autocratic, and more opposed to liberty than either that of the kings or the emperors; foreign too, in spite of the unspiritual bond between France and the Vatican found in a common enmity to the union of Italy. Yet is she still so noble and so great that the mass of Frenchmen hold the Church of France to be the truest and grandest form of religion accessible to them, whether they embrace or refuse it.

INDEX.

	PAGE
ABELARD	162
Abjuration of HIenry IV.	307
Absolution of Henry IV.	312
Agde	61
Agobard	115
Ailli, Peter d'	222
Aix, Archbishop of	435
Alacocque, Marie	409
Albigenses	169, 175–202
Albertus Magnus	186
Alcuin	100
Aleth, Bishop of	378
Alexander V.	229
,, VI.	246
Amboise, George d'	247
,, Conspiracy of	268
Anjou, Charles of	191
Anne of Brittany	247
Anse, Council of	141
Anselm	142
Appeals to Rome	157
Appeal of four bishops	408
Appel comme d'abus	316
Aquinas, S. Thomas	186
Arbrissel, Robert d'	146
Arianism	17
Ariminum	25–28
Arles	13–16, 18, 38, 60, 66, 83
,, Archbishop of	439
Arnauld, Antoine	310
,, Dr.	349–387
,, Angelique	329
Ars, Curé d'	464–467
Articles, twelve, of De Noailles	411
Asceticism	34
Assembly, General	291
,, of A.D. 1700	393
Astros, Abbé d'	455
Athanasius	17
Augustine, S.	40
,, S., of Cant.	85
Augustinus of Jansen	346, 347
Autun	11
Avignon	195, 207, 211
Avitus	48, 58
BAGAUDÆ	10
Baluc, Cardinal	240
Bangor	57
Bartholomew, the Saint	288
Barcos, Abbé de	352
Basle Council	238
Bearn, Protestants in	322
Bec	139
Benedictines	78, 91, 328, 372
Bernard, S.	152–171
Berruyer	422
Bersier	478
Berulle, De	326, 327, 331
Beza	273
Bible, Olivetanus'	260
Billets of Confession	417
Bissy, Cardinal de	402, 405
Blanche of Castile	180

	PAGE
Blois, States-General at	290
Bobio	88
Bologna, Concordat of	249–251
Boniface, S.	95–97
Borgia, Cæsar	248
Bossuet	339, 365–398
Bourbon, Cardinal	286
Bourges, States-General of	238
Bourdaloue	373
Britain	47
Broglie, Abbé de	474
Bruno, S.	146
Bus, César de	326
CAEN	142
Calvin	257
Camus	339, 375
Capitularies	103, 121
Carloman	96
Carthusians	145
Case of Conscience	395
Cassian, John	34
Casuistry	362
Catechism, Napoleon's	451
Cathedrals	173
Catherine of Siena, S.	216
Celibacy	144
Cellier	372
Censure of Luther	252–253
Chaise, Père de la	378
Chalons	90
Champeaux, William of	153
Chantal, Madame de	328
Chaplains, Royal	114
Charity, Sisters of	332
Charlemagne	98–100
Charles Martel	92
Charles VIII.	240
Chateaubriand	458
,, edict of	266
Châtel	311
Chilperic	79
Chorepiscopi	108
Chrodegang	99, 111
Cistercians	145
Clairvaux	153–160
Clemangis	222, 223
Clement V.	195–198
,, IX.	370
Clermont	49
Clotaire	73
Clotilda	72
Clovis	58–72
Cluny	130, 142, 154
Cæsarius, S.	58
Cælestine, Pope	47
Colbert	381
Coligny	269
Columbanus, S.	57, 86–89
Comminges, Bishop of	370
Communes	149, 150
Communion	80
Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary	171
Concini	319
Concordat of Napoleon I.	448–457
Condren	333
Congruiste	427
Conrad	166
Consalvi	456
Constantine	12
Constance, Council of	231, 234
Constantius	18–29
Constitution, Civil	433–438
Contestatio	56
Coquerel	478
Corbey	101
Cornet	354
Coton	315, 316
Councils, general	193, 194, 224, 228
,, provincial	273
Courayer, Le	421
Coz, Le	439
Cramaud, Simon de	228
Crecy	209
Crescens, S.	2
Crispin, S.	9
Crispus	17
Crosses	166, 169
Crusade	135, 147, 165, 191

PAGE

Cum occasione, bull . . . 359
Curés of Paris 362
Cyprian, S. 6–8
Cyran, Abbé de S. . . 340–350

DAGOBERT 89
Decadi 444, 445
Decrees of Trent 284
Denis, S., Abbey of . . 101, 173
De Maistre, Joseph 458, 461, 470
De Retz 362, 364
De Sacy 368
Descartes 353
Diana of Poitiers 265
Didon 473
Dionysius, S. 9
Dominicans 178
Drogo 116
Dubois 409, 411
Du Moulin 266, 285
Dupanloup . . . . . 464 *n.*
Dupin 379, 398, 408
Du Prat 258
Durandus 200

EBBO 115
Education 201
Election of bishops . 52, 63, 77, 290, 292
Eloi, S. 70
Emery 455
Emigration 432
Empire of Charlemagne . . 109
End of the world 128
Epaon 69
Erasmus 255, 256
Etampes 158
Eucherius, S. 43–45
Euric 50
Everlasting Gospel . . . 205
Exemptions . . . 137, 171, 200
Expectatives 221

FABRONI 400
Fact, questions of 362

PAGE

Faustus 41
Fenelon 390–394
Feudal system 127
Filioque 98, 109
Five Propositions 354
Fleury 411
Florianus 79
Fontevraud 146
Forged Decretals 124
Four bishops 368
France, Popes in 195–217, 220–229
Francis I. 248–265
Franciscans . . . 183, 187, 201
Franks 62, 63
Fredegonda 79
Frequent Communion . 350, 352

GALLICANISM 227, 309, 381, 420
Ganganelli 426
Garasse, Père 340
Gaston of Orleans 339
Gerbert 131–134
Germanus, S. 347
Gerson 222–236
Glanfeuil 79
Gobel 436, 440
Godescalk 119
Goths 46
Græcus, Bishop 51
Greek 42
Gregoire, Bishop . 399, 429–447
Gregory, S. 83
,, of Tours . . 66, 79, 80
Guerin, Eugenie de . . . 465
Guignard 312
Guises 265, 289, 297
Guizot 41, 66
Gundobald 58
Gunthram 81
Guyon, Madame 389

HARDERAR 78
Harlay, De 315, 376
Hecquet 419
Henry II. 265

PAGE

Henry III. 289–299
,, IV. 300
Herluin 139
Hildebrand 140, 143
Hildebert 156
Hilary of Arles 38
,, of Poitiers . . 19–30
Hincmar 117
Holland 420
Honoratus, S. 38
Hours, Canonical . . . 57, 59
Hugh Capet 131
Huguenots 269

IMMACULATE Conception . 467
Indulgences 173
Infallibility 383, 468
Injuriosus 75
Innocent III. 178
Inquisition 179, 182, 268
Instruction of Henry IV. . 306
Investiture 148, 151
Irenæus, S. 3–5
Ireland, Church of . . . 86
Italian republics 159
Ivo of Chartres 143, 148

JANSENIUS 340
Jacquerie 211
January, Edict of 278
Jews . . . 55–60, 82, 166, 196
Jesuits 276, 310, 312, 314, 319, 334
Jesuitism 257
Joan of Arc 237
Joseph, Père 342
John XXII. 203. 207
Julian 29
Jumiéges 130

KING, ecclesiastical power of the 190, 214

LA SALETTE 464
La Mennais 461
Lanfranc 139

PAGE

Langres 163
Languedoc 169
Lavalette 424
Lazare, S. 428
League, the Catholic . . . 289
Lerins 37
Leo, S. 39
Liancourt, Duke of . . 360
Liberius, Pope 18, 30
L'Hôpital 268–285
Litanies 54
Liturgy 85, 317
Lombard, Peter 172
Lombards 96
Lorraine, Cardinal of 258, 268, 280
Louis le Debonair 111
,, VII. 163
,, the German 120
,, S., IX. 180–191
,, XI. 239–241
,, XIV. 358–407
Loyola, S. Ignatius . . . 257
Lucon 401
Lully, Raymond 202
Lupus 47, 50
Luther 252
Luxeuil 101
Lyons: martyrs 2
,, council 192

MABILLON 55, 372
Macon Council . . . 81, 82
Maintenon, Madame de . . 402
Maistre, de 249
Mamertus, Claudius . . . 41
,, Bishop 54
Manuscript 65
Martin, S. 30–34
,, V., Pope 235
Maret, Mgr. 459, 469
Margaret of Navarre . . . 254
Mariana 319, 334
Maur, S. 78
Maury, Cardinal 455
Mayors of the Palace . . . 92

PAGE

Mazarin, Cardinal . . 342, 345
Medard, S., riots 278
,, miracles . . . 418
Medici, Catherine de . . 263–298
,, Alexander de . . 313
,, Mary de 319
Melancthon 254
Melun, General Assembly at 291
Mendicants, complaints of . 192, 209, 230
Minorites 201
Mirabeau 435
Missions 51
Mission, Congregation of the 332
Molay, Jacques de . . . 197
Molesme, Robert de . . . 145
Monod 478
Mons 369
Montalembert 457
Monasticism 30, 35, 65, 78, 200
Monte Cassino 78
Montfort, Simon de . . . 178
Mornay, Du Plessis . . 303–308

NANTES, Edict of . 313, 314, 384
Naples 246
Napoleon I. 446
,, III. 447–453
New Testament 368
Noailles, De 388–415
Normandy 177
Normans 129
Notre Dame 173
Novara 248

OBEDIENCE, withdrawal of 213, 215
Olier 333
Olive, Pierre d' . . . 202, 205
Oppede 262
Optatus Gallus 343
Orange, Council of . . 61, 62
Oratory of France, the . . 326
Organic Articles 449
Orleans, Council of . . . 71

PAGE

Otho II. 133
Oulfroi 79
Ozanam 465

PAMIERS, Bishop of . . . 378
Paris, Synod of . . . 28, 77, 89
,, Schools of 155
,, the Deacon 418
Pascal 361
Paschasius Radbertus . . 117
Pastoureaux 184
Patronage, Royal 258
Pavillon 363, 366, 378
Peace of God 137
Pelagianism 39
Penance, public 105
Pepin 96
Pérefixe, Archbishop . . 364, 365
Perier, Mademoiselle . . . 356
Perreyve, H. 465
Persecution . . 21, 33, 136, 166, 176–214, 215, 245, 255, 256, 266–277, 370
Peter the Venerable . . 154–163
,, de Bruys 169
Petit, Dr. J. . . . . 230 *n.*
Petrarch 213
Phœbadius 27
Philip I. 144–149
,, the Fair 193
,, II. of Spain . . . 305
Pichon 422
Pirot 362
Pius II. 241
,, VII. 448–453
Pisa Council 228
Pluralities 199
Poirée, Gilbert de la . . 167, 168
Poissy, Colloquy . . . 272–276
Poitiers, Council of . . . 149
,, Count of 160
Politico-Protestant . . . 287
Politicians 288
Port Royal 329–400
Pot, Louis 244

PAGE

Pragmatic Sanction . . . 189
,, of Bourges . 238–240
Predestination 120
Premonstratensians . . . 152
Presseusé, De 478
Priscillianism 33
Property 204
Protestantism 478–480
Provincial Letters 361

Quesnel 398–406
Quietism 389

Rabanus Maurus 118
Radegonda 73
Ratramn 118
Ravaillac 319
Reason, Goddess of . . . 440
Reformation 252
Regale 208, 377–380
Regent d'Orleans . . . 407–411
Reims, Council of 151
Remy, S. 68
Retreats 331
Richelieu 323–346
Richer 320, 357
Right of spoil 221
Robert, King 136
Robespierre 440
Rochelle, Bishop of La . . 401
Roland 438
Romorantin 269

Sadolet 259
Saint-Amour, William de . 189
Sainte-Chapelle . . 173, 183
Sales, S. Francis de . . . 327
Salic law 374
Salisbury, John of 172
Salvian 45–47
Santarelli 335
Saracens 94
Saturninus 21
Satyre Menippée 309
Schimmelpenninck, Mrs. . 400

PAGE

Schism, the great . . . 218–239
Schools 64–66
Schoolmen 147, 172
Seleucia 25–28
Seminaries 333
Semi-Pelagians 39–41
Senate 97
September massacres . . . 439
Serfs 185
Severus, Sulpicius 32
Sidonius Apollinaris . 41, 48–55
Sieyes 63*n.*, 428
Sigismund 68
Sigismund, Emperor . . . 231
Simplicius 53
Sirmium 25
Sixtus V. 295–300
Soanen, Bishop 415
Sorbonne 187, 298
Spires 166
Spirituals 202, 4
States-General . . . 270, 272
Suger 155–170
Sully, Bishop 173
Sully 310
Sulpice, S. 333
Sunday 108
Supreme Being, Fête of . . 441
Symphorian, S. 6
Synod, Protestant 268

Taine 432, 460, 474
Talleyrand 430–432
Taxes on the clergy 208, 210, 211, 246, 339, 345
Tellier 400–407
Templars . . 157, 158, 196–198
Tencin 409, 415
Tenth century 127
Theodulf 105
Theophilanthropy 445
Three Questions 120
Tillemont 372
Tones, Roman 102
Toulouse, Count of . 178, 180

	PAGE
Toulouse, Council of	102, 182
Tours	32
Transubstantiation	168
Trent	262-283
Treves	17, 46
Trophimus, S.	2
Troslei, Synod of	128
Troyes, Council of	157
Truce of God	138
UNIGENITUS, bull	404–417
Unity of the Church	233
University of Paris	179, 187, 221, 223, 244
Urban V.	211
VALENCE, Bishop of	269–272
Vandals	46
Vaudois	245, 250, 252
Vezelay	165
Vienne, Council of	197–202
Vincennes, Conference of	205
Vincent de Paul, S.	330–333, 429
Vincentius of Lerins	40
Vineam Domini, bull	398
Vintimille, Archbishop	421
Visigoths	50
Vision of God	206
Visitation, Order of the	328
Vitry, Jacques de	186
Voltaire	423
WAKE, Archbishop	421
Wala	113
Waldenses	175
Waldrada	124
Ward, W. G.	470 *n.*
Worms	114

THE END.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

459935

HEcF Smith, Richard Travers
S The Church in France.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED